

FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL AND GOETHE,
1790-1802

A STUDY IN EARLY GERMAN ROMANTICISM

BY
JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL

[Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXI, 1]

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
1906

247/61

FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL AND GOETHE
1790-1802

A STUDY IN EARLY GERMAN ROMANTICISM

BY

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL

*A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY*



BALTIMORE

1906

FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL AND GOETHE,
1790-1802 :

A STUDY IN EARLY GERMAN ROMANTICISM.

INTRODUCTION.

a. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS.

Friedrich Schlegel, youngest son of Johann Adolf Schlegel, was born at Hannover on March 10, 1772, just three months after Goethe had finished the first version of his first great work, *Götz von Berlichingen*. His literary career begins in 1794 with the publication of *Von den Schulen der Griechischen Poesie*. At this time he is as old as Goethe was when writing the *Götz*.

In the meantime Goethe has written many great works, passed through several cultural stages, been enriched by varied experiences, and in the great general aspects of his character as also in the essentials of his *Weltanschauung* become a *developed* man. Life will deepen, knowledge widen with the coming years, but the Italian journey (September 3, 1786-June 18, 1788), with its revolutionary influences, is past, and twenty years (since November, 1775) of responsible public service in great little Weimar by the side of his devoted friend, the Duke, whom he loved and praised,¹ have had their sedative influence upon the stormy genius of the period of *Götz* and *Werther*. The unique literary friendship with Schiller, who has been at Weimar and Jena since 1787, is just beginning with the establishment of the *Horen*.

On the other hand Schlegel is but little beyond the first

¹ *GWke.* v. Venetian Epigrams, No. 35.

stadia of his intellectual progress. He has scarcely begun a development which is to be conditioned to a remarkable degree by the great minds of the period and by certain great thinkers and writers of the past, and will result in an almost complete reversal of his attitude toward all problems of literature, philosophy, and life. These great influences are Plato, the Greek dramatists, the Platonizing Hemsterhuis, Winckelmann, Herder, Kant, Fichte, Schiller, and Goethe. Personal relations will exist with the last three. The relative force of these influences will vary widely at different stages of his progress. The Hellenizing influence is based in a general way upon Winckelmann, but stands in the closest relations to the doctrines and practice of the Weimar classicists. Kant's critical philosophy, supplemented by Fichte and modified by Schiller, is a second powerful moment and becomes more and more important toward the close. Goethe's works (this can hardly be overemphasized) are influential from first to last. They are the atmosphere in which Schlegel as a literary student breathes. They are the concrete examples of all possible literary excellence since the Greeks. Their author is the acknowledged leader of Weimar culture when Weimar is the center of German letters. Schlegel as a literary aspirant knows no higher goal than the approval of this genius whom he is soon to glorify with extravagant daring as "Gott, Vater."¹

Friedrich's attitude toward Goethe had, however, materially changed before 1804, about which time many evidences of the alteration exist. The least arbitrary date near this period is naturally the date of Schlegel's departure for Paris, the date of the final dispersion of the older Romantic school. Since the earliest known sources of information concerning Friedrich² begin in 1791, we may select the year of student

¹ *RDBr.*, Bd. I, p. 36.

² *WSBr.*

life at Göttingen in company with August Wilhelm as the beginning of his development. The most important years of his activity are thus included between 1790 and 1802. These limits are further favored by the second great source of our knowledge of Friedrich's early career, *Friedrich Schlegels prosaische Jugendschriften, 1794-1802*, edited by Minor.

No complete statement of Friedrich Schlegel's personal and literary relations to Goethe exists. Much work has been done upon certain phases of the dependence, but even here contributions may be made. Statements have been made recently that Goethe learned much from the earlier romantics, but few definite evidences are produced in their support. It has seemed advisable therefore *to collect into one complete statement, so far as possible, what is certainly known of the relationship of Friedrich Schlegel to Goethe during the period above fixed.*

b. RELATIONS AS SEEN IN LATER LIFE.

Goethe published his correspondence with Schiller in 1828-9, just as Friedrich's unfortunate career was drawing to its close. The severe judgments of Schiller upon the character, accomplishments, and pretensions of both Schlegels, with the contemporary assent of Goethe in all essential points, were given to the public unaccompanied by the least hint of Goethe's own disapproval of their sharpness and with no disavowal of his own present belief in Schiller's correctness. August Wilhelm, mindful of his outwardly pleasant relations with Goethe during those fruitful years in Jena, was surprised and pained at such revelations. To defend himself and his brother against these criticisms an edition of the Goethe-Schlegel correspondence was planned. But it did not appear. The surviving brother vented his

feelings, however, in print. His attack appeared in Wendt's *Musen Almanach* for 1832, issued in the fall of 1831. To the shame of August Wilhelm, his harshest thrusts were aimed at the dead friend Schiller and not at Goethe.¹ Zelter calls Goethe's attention to these "galligwässrige" attacks in a letter of October 15, 1831. To this circumstance we owe the latest, completest, and most positive expression of Goethe's views of the character of the Schlegels and especially of his relations with them.²

This letter is too well known to need quotation, though almost every line of it is important for our problem. The relations of Goethe to the Schlegels, according to this direct testimony, were (a) universal tolerance, not hearty favor, (b) the furthering of that which he himself did not approve, (c) an effort to keep up a sort of social relation with them, though (d) he stood outside of the romantic circle and would have been extinguished by them, but for his own solid worth, and (e) he did not trouble himself about others while following out his own designs. Schiller's hatred is justified as right, and their accomplishment in all fields except the oriental is discredited.

Such statements roundly deny any real sympathy with the romantic doctrines and practises of the Schlegels and imply a degree of artistic and literary isolation incompatible with mutual influence.

This letter cannot be credited to momentary bitterness at August Wilhelm's attack on Schiller in Wendt's *Almanach*. If bitterness dictated it, it was a settled bitterness of a quarter of a century. Many utterances of Goethe from 1804 until his death seem to show that the bitterness was a part of the settled consistent judgment of all his riper years.

¹ *BXen.*, Bd. II, p. 285 ff.

² *GZBr.*, Bd. VI, pp. 315 f. and 318 ff.; Goethe an Zelter, October 26, 1831.

In a conversation with Sulpiz Boisserée, May 25, 1826, he charges the Schlegels with dishonesty and an evil influence upon free investigation.¹ In 1819, in conversation with an anonymous person (F. A. Wolf?) he charges them with attempting to throttle him with friendly words, rob him of himself, and make him other than himself; they were thus his worst enemies.² Another conversation with Boisserée shows that Goethe called Friedrich a "Schelm" in spite of all the artist's defense of his friend. Boisserée explained this language as due to envy and pride of faint-hearted old age, etc.³ Several very important facts are omitted from Boisserée's report, which would have given a key to Goethe's full meaning. We do not learn what arguments were presented by Sulpiz in favor of Friedrich's honesty, the truth of which might be granted without involving a denial of the appearance of dishonesty. Perhaps *irony* was urged, that unconscious accompaniment of a life without inward fundamental convictions. We must admit that Friedrich's conduct toward Goethe and his works had every appearance of insincerity, if one assumes in his character that fixity of opinion which marks the ripened man. It was no forced inference when Goethe concluded that the Schlegels had a dishonest purpose in their praise of him. We should further like to know what statements of Goethe were considered well-grounded and what were concordant with things which must be admitted. Thus we should be in condition to judge whether the "chief point" rested merely upon personalities, and also to estimate the degree of justice in Sulpiz's reference of Goethe's words to motives of envy and pride. Without these further facts we have here simply a confirmation of Goethe's usual attitude accompanied by an interpretation

¹ *BGG.*, Bd. v, p. 290, No. 1038.

² *Ibid.*, Bd. viii, p. 357, No. 1531.

³ *Ibid.*, Bd. iii, p. 14, May 9, 1811.

equally liable to personal coloring, for the Boisserées were loyal disciples of Friedrich, and Goethe had every opportunity to know the character and capacity of Schlegel at first hand and as accurately as they.

Several years earlier we have a number of utterances which are in point. On May 17, 1808, Goethe is angry at Schlegel's imputation to him of Voltaire's principles. This is interpreted as an attempt to discredit him while using his name for financial advantage.¹ To this period belongs also the report of a conversation by Falk in which the claims of the Schlegels to literary dictatorship are satirically disposed of. Goethe is resigned to the prospective loss of his imperial mantle, since it does not involve the loss of his head too, and expects to die in peace in his bed beside his beloved Ilm.² Several days later Goethe again attacked the literary anarchy of Germany, this time "mit dreimal kaustischer Lauge" and directed a volley at Friedrich Schlegel as the self-styled Hercules of German literature.³

Goethe brought out an edition of his collected works in 1808. Friedrich reviewed them for the romantic organ, the *Heidelberger Jahrbücher*. The former sworn eulogist of Goethe could not break entirely with his past and appear in his true attitude before the world while his former utterances were so readily accessible. He could now no longer praise with a full throat, so we have a carefully toned-down repetition of much that he had already said. Whoever compares this performance with previous reviews becomes at once aware of the whole vast change in personal relations.⁴ Goethe could say complacently that he was content, he understood how the review had been produced, but as an

¹ *Ibid.*, Bd. II, p. 144; Bericht von Frh. Schopenhauer.

² *Ibid.*, Bd. II, p. 202 ff., No. 357, April 18, 1808.

³ *Ibid.*, Bd. II, p. 208, No. 357b.

⁴ *FSWke.*, Bd. VIII, p. 117 ff.

artist he was not content with a mere historical account of how his works came to be.¹ On April 6, 1808, Goethe declares that the judgment of Schlegel rests upon the principle of the game of dominoes in which each one praises the piece to which he can play his own to advantage.²

So far we have a consistent attitude on the part of Goethe, now jesting, now in bitter earnest, but always condemnatory. The charge of dishonesty, overweening assumption of authority, the use of his name and fame for self-advancement, etc., constantly recurs. If we consider a word of wisdom from the Goethe of almost fourscore, "überall lernt man nur von dem, den man liebt," we must admit little probability that anything for which Friedrich Schlegel stood would find acceptance because he stood for it, or would be influential with Goethe in this long closing period of his life.

That this dislike was heartily returned by Friedrich is equally certain, though recorded utterances are rarer. A sort of reflection of this feeling of dislike is found in the correspondence of his wife Dorothea, though she is doubtless more radically outspoken than he. Her utterances may be found in a letter to Caroline Paulus from Cologne, 1804, also July 13, 1805.³ He has no "Gemüt," no love, is "versteinert," and his whole artistic and personal life is "Sächsisch-weimarisches Heidenthum." Only the first part of *Faust* awakens enthusiasm in 1808, but even here Tieck's *Genoveva* and Calderon's dramas are the standards by which Goethe is judged. Goethe's *Rhein und Main Buch* is the object of her violent denunciation in letters to Boisserée in 1810⁴ and to her sons in 1816.⁵ She charges Goethe with an evil purpose in ignoring the merits of Friedrich Schlegel as a pioneer in this field of German art. The much admired

¹ *BGG.*, Bd. II, p. 209.

² *BGG.*, Bd. II, p. 201, No. 356.

³ *RDBr.*, Bd. I, pp. 143 and 155 f.

Ibid., p. 428.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Bd. II, p. 355 ff.

Wilhelm Meister has become the object of contempt by 1810.¹ Friedrich may not have gone to such lengths in adverse judgment, but he shared them to a certain extent at least, and for somewhat the same reason. It was his entrance into the Roman fold. In a postscript to one of her letters to Caroline Paulus in 1806 he writes: "Meine ehemaligen sogenannten Freunde, als Calvinische, Lutherische, Herrnhutische, — theistische, atheistische und idealistische mit eingerechnet, haben sich, meines einzigen leiblichen Bruders ausgenommen, der aber auch ein sehr schlechter Calviner ist, sämmtlich als wahres Zigeunergesindel gegen mich aufgeführt."² Goethe must be included in one or more of the above categories.

Looking at the whole matter of the breach between Goethe and the Schlegels, and the consequent relations among them for a quarter of a century, we see at its center the question of religious affiliation. But this was not all. An honest Catholic either by birth and training or by genuine conversion was not an object of dislike to Goethe. Friedrich's entrance into the Roman church after a period of uncompromising individualism and after his efforts to establish a new religion on the basis of Goethe's culture and Fichte's idealism, his entrance into the service of a reactionary monarchy after his enthusiastic essay on Republicanism, whose tone was too democratic to find favor with Goethe,³ his doctrine of romantic poetry and his preference for northern and oriental literatures after an excessive exaltation of Hellenism, his assumption of dictatorial office in the realm of German letters and his subsequent degradation of Goethe's works after having declared them the canon of all German poetic art, all these things seemed to Goethe to

¹ *Ibid.*, Bd. I, p. 262; Aus Dorothea's *Tagebuch*, Nos. 38, 39.

² *Ibid.*, p. 166.

³ *HRS.*, p. 337.

signify that Friedrich Schlegel was unsound and false, dishonest at bottom, or, if not, then at least so variable and unreliable that nothing could be made of him. The Schlegels seem to have wished to force Goethe into following their aesthetic leading and acknowledging their supremacy in the field of sound criticism. Goethe would not follow them into their romantic region of whimsy and arbitrariness of fancy, and they turned from him. Goethe was the sound realist with steady purpose and clear insight, Schlegel the unripe brilliant vagarist. August Wilhelm knew this as well as anyone.¹ No permanent friendly relations with such a being were possible. His own brother could not endure it to the end.

Feeling always colors the judgment. However, its demonstrated existence during later life must not lead us to assume an exaggerated degree of friendliness and even a sort of discipleship earlier.

Goethe himself seems to admit that mutually helpful relations existed. Two passages are of especial importance, though we could wish in them more detail and less vagueness. In a conversation with Eckermann, on March 12, 1825, he tries to account for certain advantages due to his peculiar relations to the older men, Lessing, Winckelmann, and Kant, and to the younger men, Schiller, the Humboldts, and the Schlegels. He says: "Es sind mir daher unnennbare Vortheile entstanden." This may apply to the influences of the whole group, or if it be taken to apply only to the latter, as is possible, it must refer chiefly to the prosodic aid received from Wilhelm von Humboldt and August Wilhelm Schlegel.² Again, in Goethe's posthumous essay, *Einwirkung*

¹ *AWSWke.*, Bd. VIII, p. 292; Brief an Windischmann, December 29, 1834.

² *GGE.*, May 12, 1825.

der neuern Philosophie, written about 1817,¹ he refers to the influence of Niethammer in clarifying his conceptions of philosophy, and hints vaguely at certain advantages accruing from similar efforts on the part of the Schlegels. This, of course, can apply only to Friedrich Schlegel, whose conversations on idealism were contemporaneous with Niethammer's *colloquia*. We could wish that Goethe had found opportunity to indicate in some way, however briefly, what kind and degree of influence he attributed to the various persons mentioned. But all is left vague and undeterminable.²

FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL'S CAREER.

A. TO PUBLICATION OF *VON DEN SCHULEN*.

1. *Göttingen*.

There are no contemporary records of Friedrich's life in Göttingen in 1790-1. He studied under Heyne, busied himself with philology and æsthetics, as well as jurisprudence, for which he came to the university. He was associated with August Wilhelm and a small group of friends.

According to his own later testimony, Plato, the tragedians and Winckelmann formed the atmosphere of his life about this time. His seventeenth year would be 1789, or the year preceding the Göttingen period.³ In this same year he saw the collection of antiquities in Dresden for the first time. Did this atmosphere continue at Göttingen? Certain testimony in later letters seems to involve an affirmative answer.

On January 1, 1794, when collecting materials for his first Greek publications, he says that he has not yet "*reread*"

¹ *Goethe und Kant*, Karl Vorländer, *G.-Jahrb.*, xix, pp. 180 ff.

² *Goethe's Nachlass*, Bd. x, p. 54.

³ *FSWke.*, Bd. vi, pp. iv ff.

the works of Aristophanes and Euripides, nor yet completely worked through Aeschylus, etc.¹ The first reading must have antedated the earliest letter to August Wilhelm, since we have in this correspondence a most complete record of Friedrich's intellectual interests, and no Greek reading is mentioned until about September, 1793, from which time forward it is a marked feature.

That this first reading was not *thorough* is proved by the immense difficulty which he has in 1793-4. It must also seem strange that an *absorbing* study carried on *in spite of parental purposes to the contrary*, should have sunk so completely into the background of his interests during his first two whole years at Leipzig, as will appear from an examination of his letters.

On February 10, 1794, he declares that it was his inclination to investigate art where it was *indigenous*, and that it was necessary to his very life to begin his career with the study of art. He adds: "Du erinnerst Dich einiger mitgetheilten Plane in Göttingen. *Sie sind nicht vergessen, und enthielten den Keim meiner jetzigen Absicht.*"² When we compare this statement with his contemporary work, we might assume that some embryonic Hellenic project had begun to stir in the mind of Friedrich at Göttingen. A more definite notion of what his present purpose is can be gained from a letter of December, 1793, where he names such essays as *Über die Moralität der Griechischen Tragiker*, *Über die Nachahmung der Griechischen Dichter*, *Apologie des Aristophanes*; also a translation of *Orestes* and the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus. The register then proceeds: "Bei dem was ich Dir in Hannover ankündigte, bleibt's." This refers certainly to the meeting of the brothers in the summer of 1793, when Caroline was on the way to her retreat at Lucha, and not to their short

¹ WSB., p. 158.

² *Ibid.*, p. 165.

stay in Hannover before August Wilhelm's departure for Amsterdam in May, 1791. To what it refers is not known. It may have been a promise to concentrate his energies upon some self-supporting work of a literary nature. It is clear that this whole definite plan is *recent* and only the *germ* of it is referred to Göttingen.¹

A complete characterization of Greek literature and life, especially of Greek poetry, seems to hover before Schlegel's eyes, such a characterization as he once proposed to August Wilhelm with respect to Roman literature, such a characterization of the Greeks as he once planned for himself concerning the Germans, or such as he tried to make of several individual great poets. However, if the *germ* of any such plan did exist as early as 1790 it was incapable of development and fell completely out of sight for two whole years of intellectual foraging in various fields. If not *forgotten*, it was so *overwhelmed* by other interests that it never came to expression in one of the most intimate correspondences ever conducted, even when poetic art and art criticism were his special themes.

It is conceivable that a youth of eighteen in the dominantly classical atmosphere of the circle of Heyne's pupils should find Hemsterhuis delightful and Winckelmann inspiring, should follow the best minds of the day in their gropings for the light of Greek antiquity, and thus vaguely dream of some great work for himself to do in this new and fruitful field. But the plan, or dream, dropped out of sight completely.

That it dropped out of sight must have its explanation, and it seems most probable that his classicism at Göttingen *has been simply overrated*. His whole interest is not even in the classics, especially not in the Greeks. He devoted much

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 148-9.

time to current German literature and was more moved by Goethe and Klopstock than by all other Hellenizing forces combined.

At his parting from his brother in Hannover, the words of Goethe's *An Schwager Chronos* come into their minds. This and the *Prometheus*, as contrasted with Herder's poems, have a magic force: "An ein solches Wort heftet sich so viel Erinnerung ehemaligen Entschlusses und Genusses—so dass es plötzliches Licht in die Finsternis bringt."¹ In the very first letter from Leipzig we see the enthusiastic Goethe-worshipper, full of the echoes of the *Faust* fragment. His motto is the quatrain beginning

"Die Geisterwelt ist nicht verschlossen."

The slight inaccuracy of quotation here, as also in the case of *An Schwager Chronos* on another occasion, is the best possible evidence of the power which the *Faust* of 1790 and Goethe's lyrics had upon him.² Schlegel has the deepest sympathy with the "Himmelsstürmer" *Faust* who is in search of the absolute. He turns to Nature, which is infinite, and will use her for sublime contemplation, like *Faust*, and find strength and healing in her. The *Faust*, if completed, would surpass Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. But enough for the present that this supreme interest in Goethe antedates his Leipzig university career and is contemporaneous with any then existing Hellenism. It must have been a very essential part of his intellectual atmosphere, if not the dominant one as in the years immediately following.

If we consider Friedrich Schlegel's character as a whole at this time, all doubt as to his real inclinations must vanish. Haym has admirably collected the materials which are scattered throughout the early letters: "Wenn wir die

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 1 and 4.

Summe der brieflichen Selbstbekenntnisse des jungen Mannes ziehen, so tritt uns darin ganz jener Geist der Selbstüberspannung, jenes unklare, titanische Streben, jenes zuchtlose Spiel mit leidenschaftlichen Einbildungen entgegen, welches seit den siebziger Jahren in unserer Litteratur so vielfach Ausdruck gefunden hatte," etc.¹ This careful and most just estimate makes it perfectly clear that any sympathy with the Greeks at this time must have been conditioned greatly by Storm and Stress motives.

One suspects that Goethe's *Werther*, *Prometheus*, and *Faust* have contributed not a little to strengthen this element in Friedrich's character. Titanic revolt against tyranny, contest of the individual against Fate, coarse strength, and indomitable will are the positive elements that appeal to him, and these are far removed from that "edle Einfalt und stille Grösse"² which Winckelmann saw in Greek art. Storm and Stress elements were dominant over all others in Göttingen. They were primary in point of time also, and Schüddekopf is in error when he asserts that the critical leaders of romanticism do not start from Storm and Stress, but from the Forster circle.³

For Friedrich the most prominent representative of the movement is Goethe. At first Klopstock is a close second. At a greater distance stand Schiller and Herder.

2. Leipzig, Dresden.

a. Utterances about Goethe.

After arriving in Leipzig conditions remain little changed for some time. Goethe stands in the midst of all his interests,

¹ *HRs.*, Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen, No. 3, pp. 873 ff. The whole passage should be carefully considered in connection with this subject. Cf. letters in *WSBr.*

² *WGed.*, pp. 24, 26, 29, etc.

³ *GuR.*, Bd. I, p. xvi.

as may be seen from the frequent utterances in regard to him. First comes his *Wahlspruch* from *Faust* (May 18, 1791) and then the contrast of Herder and Goethe, to the latter's great advantage (June 4). This is followed by a considerable passage from *An Schwager Chronos*,

Sieh, die Sonne sinkt, etc. (July 21),

which is pointed with a question: "Was könnte wohl eher die *Sonne* des Lebens genannt werden als der Enthusiasmus oder die Liebe? Ich wüsste nicht zu was ein Alter ohne sie lebte, als etwa seinen Geist stückweise abfaulen zu sehen." This reminds us of the despairing old scholar Faust with the words on his lips:

"Es möchte kein Hund so länger leben," etc.

On August 26, he has found one person in Leipzig with an appreciation for poetry—a merchant who enjoys Goethe's *Prometheus* and *Schwager Chronos*.¹ On November 8, Goethe is classed with Frederick the Great, Klopstock, Winckelmann, and Kant, as the greatest Germans known to fame, whose greatness he calls "ursprünglich Deutsch." Such men are rare in all generations, and these have some qualities that no people known to us have had a presentiment of. Klopstock belongs to this class on moral grounds, not literary. In fact, Friedrich's judgments here are decidedly preclassic. Aesthetic interests are completely subordinated to the moral. Poetry is an ornament of life, and has as yet no justification within itself for its existence.²

On February 11, Friedrich tries to encourage August Wilhelm by showing that what the latter condemned in himself as simply "Übersetztalent" was the most admirable quality of Goethe, the power of entering into the

¹ *WSBr.*, p. 13.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 36 and 125.

innermost recesses of a great soul and interpreting it. August was right, however, for there is a vast difference between interpreting the *Divina Commedia* or *Romeo and Juliet* and the creation of a Götz, a Tasso, or a Faust. Yet Friedrich's sophistry shows that Goethe was considered the great interpreter of human life.¹ We have also a comparison of Goethe's *Faust* with Klinger's, with a decided preference for the former; also a notice of Goethe's portrait by Lips: "ein herrlicher Kopf," etc.²

Two months later, April 13, 1792, Schlegel finds the *Gross-Cophtha* lifeless. He sees in the recent works of Goethe an unpardonable falling off from the excellence of earlier works.³ The *Cophtha* must have been written during sleep, as Caroline said. At least Goethe's *genius* had not kept awake.

Again, a little later, in the same critical strain but more specific: "Der Inbegriff seiner Werke (*i. e.*, the recent ones) ist der Abdruck einer eigennützigen, kaltgewordenen Seele." Götz, Werther, Faust, Iphigenie, Prometheus, and Schwager Chronos were the beginnings of a great man, but the poet soon became a courtier, no longer a Storm and Stress leader. Here, too, even Goethe's best works are blamed for their *intentional* truth, "peinlich gelernte Wissenschaft, nicht angebornes Wesen."⁴ Friedrich is out of touch with the Goethe of Weimar.

In May, 1793, there is a brief reference to Reichardt's music for *Erwin und Elmire*.

In the following letter, No. 25, undated, where a first attempt is made to formulate æsthetic ideas, Goethe's Götz, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *Romeo*, and Schiller's *Don Carlos* are the only illustrative materials. The complaint occurs here: "man darf fordern dass die Werke des Dichters nicht

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

² *Ibid.*, p. 39.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

kleiner sind, als er selbst, wie man Goethen Schuld giebt.”¹ In poetic truth Schlegel demands *depth* and *similitude to nature*. In respect to these qualities Goethe and Klopstock are paired and placed above Schiller but beneath Shakespeare. The character of a poet is defined as “Trieb zur Darstellung.” A poet’s perfection is “die allgemeine Fähigkeit *alles* gut darzustellen.” “Und es scheint dies Goethens Absicht gewesen zu sein.”² Even Goethe and Klopstock have erred, *e. g.*, in *Götz* and the *Barditen*, but the day is breaking upon the Germans, and when it breaks it will be a great day. It is no great step from this to Schlegel’s proclamation of Goethe as the “Morgenröthe echter Kunst.”

On June 2, 1793, Goethe is classed with Kant, Klopstock, Hemsterhuis, Spinoza, and Schiller as a great man whose spirit Friedrich has sought to fathom; a testimony to that carefulness and frequency of reading necessary to the profound formative influence assumed.³

With the exception of one brief mention of Reichardt’s music, we have no further reference to Goethe until September 29, when Schlegel is in the midst of his studies of Greek tragedy. In connection with Aeschylus and Sophocles only Shakespeare and Goethe are mentioned. The best Greek tragedy represents a contest of the human heart with fate, in which the heart is the “victorious God.” The effect of such tragedy is the highest exaltation. Shakespeare’s *Richard III* is of this class. Goethe’s *Faust*, if completed, would perhaps attain to the same rank. His other dramas simply end well; exaltation is impossible from their very nature. *Götz* leaves too much bitterness behind, though this is only a tentative judgment.⁴

On October 23, occurs one of the most remarkable of Friedrich’s critical judgments. His doctrine is that humanity

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 87 f.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 118 f.

is the supreme thing and that art exists only for its sake. Not only Schiller and Bürger place art above nature, "ja selbst der grosse Goethe ist im Alter zu dieser Selbstvergötterung herabgesunken. Er scheint selbstgetällig seinem Genius zu lauschen, und ich erinnere mich dann wohl an Mozart's Musik, die in jedem Laute Eitelkeit und weibliche Verderbtheit athmet."¹

In November Friedrich finds in the *Allg. Litt. Zeit.* a review of Goethe's writings by Huber. Schlegel's comments are of some length. He finds many things well said, but the great question is unanswered "warum Apelles jetzt nur Linien malt." The "morality" of *Werther*, *Stella*, and *Faust* is too obscurely defended, and the last is inadequately described. "Ist es nicht fühllos und armselig ein erhabenes Gedicht so zu beschreiben? Er sage was es ist, für ihn und für das Verhältniß für welches er es beurtheilt, und wenn er kann, wie es wurde."²

On December 11, Schlegel would exchange all of Bürger's poems for Goethe's *Amor als Landschaftsmaler*. Goethe is "volksmässig genug," while Percy's *Reliques* belong to learned literature. Goethe is popular in the same sense as the Athenian poets.³ He defends Schiller's character against the attacks of August Wilhelm, but, to leave no doubt of his attitude, adds: "*Ich bewundre eigentlich keinen deutschen Dichter als Goethe.*" "Und doch ist er vielleicht nicht gerade durch Übermacht des Genies so unendlich weit über jene beiden (*i. e.*, Klopstock and Schiller) erhaben, als durch *etwas andres*. Etwas das er doch nur *beinahe* hat, was allein den Griechischen, vorzüglich den Atheniensischen Dichtern eigenthümlich ist."⁴ Goethe and the Greeks are now the key-note of Friedrich's æsthetics.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

² *Ibid.*, p. 139.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 150 f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

On December 15, he writes a long letter with frequent reference to Goethe. Goethe and Raphael only among moderns show the antique spirit, "und Goethe scheint es nur zu besitzen." Although the flatness of some later works is mentioned, the whole tone is not apologetic but frankly commendatory. Modern poets are of two classes, the musical and the plastic. Goethe inclines to the latter; Bürger, Klopstock, even Schiller, to the former. Shakespeare is the most musical of all poets. Goethe is a Greek.¹

From Dresden he writes, on February 27, 1794: "Das Problem unsrer Poesie scheint mir die Vereinigung des Wesentlich-Modernen mit dem Wesentlich-Antiken; wenn ich hinzusetze, dass Goethe, der erste einer ganz neuen Kunstperiode, einen Anfang gemacht hat sich diesem Ziele zu nähern, so wirst du mich wohl verstehen."² Goethe is thus elevated to the rank of ideal modern poet. As this passage is from the same letter in which Schlegel reports the reading of Goethe's *Iphigenie* by Caroline, we may associate this drama with the ideal above formulated and refer the new insight into Goethe's classic manner to the same brilliant interpreter.

Other notices of greater or less importance occur from time to time. He notes the announcement of *Reineke Fuchs* (April 5, 1794); the announcement of the *Horen* to succeed the *Thalia*; Goethe's Epistles, Epigrams, and Elegies are to appear in the first issue, this would be a good medium for August Wilhelm's Essays, etc. (December 7, 1794). The presence of *Goethe* and Herder in Weimar is urged as a reason for August Wilhelm's settlement at Jena (November 18, 1794). Schiller wants a characterization of Goethe, but Körner refuses to undertake it. Could not August Wilhelm do it and so gain entrance to the *Horen* and the Weimar

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 154 ff.

² *Ibid.*, p. 170.

circle? (April 28, 1795). Goethe is working upon a "*Prometheus Unbound*" (*Ibid.*).

But we have already passed the threshold of Friedrich Schlegel's public career. His essay *Von den Schulen* appeared in the *Berliner Monatschrift* before the close of 1794.

More than a score of references to Goethe and his works, most of them important and very few of them depreciatory, show how large a space he occupied in the interests of Schlegel. Klopstock is noticed but half so often, many times barely mentioned. Herder has about the same attention as Klopstock, but is never placed above second rank. Lessing is almost absent from this early period. Winckelmann has but half a dozen unimportant notices. Wieland has scarcely more. Bürger has a dozen, mostly condemnatory. Shakespeare himself has but a dozen. Dante rivals Goethe in the number of references, owing to August Wilhelm's essays and translations, but they are often mere references. Schiller alone of all the great spirits of the period receives more frequent mention than Goethe. This is due to the brothers' quarrel over Schiller's review of Bürger, and to Schiller's position as editor of the journals *Thalia* and the *Horen*. Schiller is esteemed as a man and critical genius, but not as a poet. No clearer proof could be desired to establish the contention that Goethe and his works were the *dominant literary interest of Friedrich from this earliest period*.

Yet this interest was neither uniform nor stationary. At first there was an unconditional enthusiasm for the Storm and Stress Goethe, then a period of more or less outspoken criticism because the poet's product fell below his own greatness, or was not the spontaneous gush of genius, then finally a revival of enthusiasm for Goethe *the artist* in his classic manner. *This revival falls in the late summer of 1793.*

β. Occupations.

If we compare Schlegel's intellectual occupations for the same three years, we find an equally remarkable change at the same season, *viz.* late in the summer of 1793.

On August 26, 1791, we have an account of Friedrich's arrangements at Leipzig. No Hellenism is shown. He is interested somewhat in æsthetics and philosophy, but the center of his interest is Roman civilization. He is using Montesquieu, Ferguson, and Middleton as sources. He hopes to produce a work of art which shall characterize the whole nation in the life of one of its heroes in one of its great catastrophes. This was to be a dramatic work, a sort of Roman *Götz*. Friedrich had thought of this plan in Göttingen, and he intended to treat several nations in the same way. Perhaps Herder's *Ideen* were a second incentive to the formation of these plans. The essential point is, they were not connected with the Winckelmann movement at all as yet, were to be *not investigations* but *works of art*, and *dramatic* in form.¹

We next get a glimpse of a plan to characterize Voltaire, and his method is outlined in some fulness. It is the method which he later applied to Lessing, Forster, and Jacobi, the construction of the poet out of his works and the known facts of his life, in the process of becoming. This shows the influence of Herder. Such works are more elevating, he adds, than the Ideal Beauty of the arts.²

In October, 1791, in reply to August Wilhelm's question whether he has not a desire to become a writer, he confesses to having certain plans for it. Among these projects are an *allegory*, probably in the manner of Hemsterhuis, but of which nothing further is known, and a "*Gespräch über die*

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

Poesie," which, as we know, has nothing to do with the poetry of the Greeks, nor with his essay of the same name in vol. III of the *Athenäum*. It was to be a sort of sketch embodying his views of art at their present Germanic stage.¹

He now proposes to treat Rome in a series of historical plays like those of Shakespeare, since a single drama like *Götz* is inadequate to the larger theme. The history of the king of Prussia would be a good subject for such an historical play, he thinks. But his interests are not wholly artistic. He proposes historical works for August Wilhelm's productive leisure, a history of knightly poetry, or of Greek poetry, the latter as yet considered no more important than the former.²

On November 8, he is trying his critical steel upon *Hamlet*, making those wonderful subjective interpretations which are to appear later in published essays. Incidentally, he mentions that if he attempts a *Gespräch* his wish will be to draw it wholly from native sources, "aus der immensen Eigenthümlichkeit unsrer Nation." He would not attempt a genuine Greek one. The Greeks are too distant from us, and it is best to represent excellently those things first which are round about us and in us.³

Here, too, we see how far Schlegel is from Winckelmann's canon of art. There is a greatness and beauty for every climate, even for the north pole, and for every race, however degenerate.

Again he places *Deutschheit* above *Griechheit* when considering the character of the Germans.⁴

In letter No. 6, undated, Friedrich is glad of his brother's intention to write a history of Greek poetry, but warns him of the difficulties in grasping the real inner life of such a

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

² *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴ *Ibid.*, footnote.

distant people. He himself is immersed in German imperial history.¹ When August Wilhelm drops the plan, Friedrich shows no desire to take it up himself, but suggests with apparently equal interest historical works, a history of Florence, of knighthood in Germany, of the rise and fall of the power of cities, of modern culture, of the Reformation, of the reign of the King of Prussia, of the Seven Years' War, or biographies of Wallenstein, Bernhard von Weimar, Mansfeld, Luther, Eugen, Friedrich II. No more thoroughgoing Germanism could well be imagined. He wants something "was dem deutschen Volke am nächsten liegt."²

On July 5, 1792, a passage of uncertain significance occurs. Comparing Garve (much to his disadvantage) with various great moderns, as Voltaire, Rousseau, Shaftesbury and Kant, he proceeds: "und vieler andrer, *aller Alten nicht zu gedenken*." The vague generality suggests a pious afterthought in accord with contemporary scholarly traditions. If there is any specific reference intended, the Roman historians and moralists are meant, and not the Greeks.³

On November 21, 1792, his time is devoted chiefly to law and metaphysics, with medical studies to fill up his leisure.⁴

Early in 1793 he proposes a correspondence on poetic art, but cannot begin until after Easter, because pressed with other things, a little jurisprudence (his specialty), but a great deal of earnest work in morals, theology, physiology, Kantian philosophy, and politics. His enthusiasm for these side lines shows that his prosecution of them is no "Frohndienst."⁵

Not until June does he begin his æsthetic project. Here occurs the record (June 2): "Im Studium des Shakespeare und Sophocles ward ich unterbrochen." The context does

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 28 f.

² *Ibid.*, p. 37.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

not explain this fragmentary indulgence in Sophocles. It is not the dawn of his Hellenism however, for in his wide readings at this time he has but *one purpose*, one *earnest undertaking*,—the investigation of the German spirit and the German tongue.¹

By September 29, he is at last busy with the Greek authors Aeschylus and Sophocles. Aristophanes has not yet appeared within his circle, and the supremacy of Sophocles, as poet, is affirmed with great caution. To feel how gradually the Hellenic element grows, the student should read the correspondence in its entirety for the next two years. It finds frequent expression, but study of the Greek dramatists is as yet merely an *avocation*. Friedrich's chief study is political, for he intends to produce a history of Germany as soon as he removes to Dresden.²

By December 11, the Hellenic element has increased to such an extent that he affirms, as if without fear of successful challenge, that the Greeks were the only people who had *taste*.³ Four days later the panegyric continues. Their greatness was not a sense for art, nor high culture, nor sublimity, nor understanding, but a something which includes all these.⁴

This must not blind us to the fact that other interests are still strong. History and political science are no insignificant part of his life-plan, as seen at this time. Since the disturbing events at Mainz and the fall of the Clubbists his dearest recreation is the study of Rousseau, the only political writer worthy of exhaustive study, as he says, and a type of thought is developing in him which it would be folly not to conceal. To this interest we owe his later essay on *Republicanism* in answer to Kant's "zum ewigen Frieden."⁵

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 91 f.

² *Ibid.*, p. 146.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

On November 10, Friedrich plans to continue gathering materials for two months yet, then to go to Dresden and concentrate his powers upon the composition of his treatise. Then correspondence and political studies shall cease. Yet January 1 finds him with the works of Euripides and Aristophanes and Aeschylus still unfinished.

Early in January, 1794, Schlegel removes to Dresden and begins with redoubled energies the task of mastering the Greek literature and Greek spirit. Now he consults the Greek writers upon grammar, for here as elsewhere they are "Menschen κατ' ἐξοχήν."¹ He seems wholly absorbed in Greek studies, but it is from the midst of these very studies that he announces the problem of German poetry to be the union of the antique and the modern, as begun by Goethe. One suspects that the apparent exclusiveness of Friedrich's Hellenism is due wholly to an effort to earn a decent living with his pen. Caroline's inspiration was helpful, but August Wilhelm was especially interested to escape the burden of his financial support.

But how far from exclusive his Hellenism was is seen from a vast project mentioned April 5, 1794. He has been brooding over a course of lectures on Kant's philosophy, to be delivered in 1794-5, but now postpones it for a year. Only a month later, however, the course is to be exchanged for one in the practical philosophy of the Greeks from Socrates to Carneiades, on Greek history, politics, antiquities, art, etc.²

There is a contest going on within him between two forces, the modern philosophical and historical tendency, and the classic tendency. The latter has now gained the ascendancy, but has not conquered. To satisfy it he projects a great work, a characterization of the Greeks from the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 174 and 182.

whole of their literary remains in connection with their own grammatical, rhetorical, and philosophical commentaries, and their remaining sculptures. As he looks at this great work he can say with some decision: "Das Alterthum wird meine Heimat bleiben. Habe ich mir in diesem Fache nur erst einen Namen gemacht, so hoffe ich manche schöne Wünsche wirklich zu machen, und das Studium der Alten wenigstens in Deutschland neu zu beleben."¹ At first he hopes to devote himself wholly to this task, and promises by Michaelis, 1795, three volumes of Greek Essays. "Dann wird eine Pause gemacht," he says: "die zu etwas andres bestimmt." It is not clear just what. Certainly not translations and other hackwork. Possibly the execution of his "Ergänzung, Berichtigung oder Vollendung der Kantischen Philosophie" mentioned January 20, 1795,² or the history of Germany planned for composition in Dresden, or his *Geist der neuern Geschichte* or *Kritik des Zeitalters* or *Theorie der Bildung*. The pause is devoted to the modern interests, and even in the classic studies he has a modern tendency and recognizes a union of his conflicting interests as the ideal. He could scarcely foresee that the modern would regain the ascendancy in less than two years and that the product of his brief devotion to the Greeks would remain so like a heap of ruins. After two years of hard study he declares positively, July 31, 1795, that he has more culture in the philosophic field than in that of Greek letters, and almost if not equal original inclination for it.³

In looking over these four years we find first a complete absorption in German problems: history, philosophy of history, politics, metaphysics, ethics, theology, physiology, medicine, even mathematics, and current German literature in large doses. These fill up his whole time,—by free choice,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 211.² *Ibid.*³ *Ibid.*, p. 229.

too, for his time should have been spent on the *Corpus juris*. In the late summer of 1793 the first definite practical interest in the Greek classics appears. It does not at once become absorbing, but has become predominant by the end of 1793. That this record is correct appears not only from the completeness and intimacy of the confessions of the letters, but also from a direct statement of December 11, 1793: "Eine Übersetzung des Ganzen (*i. e.*, Aeschylus' works) gehört seit einem Vierteljahre, so lange ich mich mit diesen Gegenständen beschäftige, unter meine grossen Plane."¹ Three months from December 11 is the middle of September, which coincides with the date of the first notices of Greek studies in the letters. Before September, 1793, Hellenic interests were completely in abeyance.

We must now note that the revival of enthusiasm for the classic Goethe falls in the same summer, probably in the same month with Schlegel's dawning interest in Greek tragedy. This circumstance is probably not accidental. A causal connection may exist, yet it may assume one of two possible forms: (1) A deeper insight into Greek tragedy may have opened the eyes of Schlegel to the beauties of *Iphigenie*, *Tasso*, etc., and (2) it is equally possible that a new insight into Goethe's classic manner may have awakened in a Goethe-worshipper like Friedrich a desire to drink inspiration from the same fount of art or bring an appreciation of its excellence to his countrymen. The latter seems more consistent with his subsequent career, for Schlegel's *Studium der Griechischen Poesie* was, after all, as we shall see, produced in support of Weimar classicism. He begins with the dramatists, and the very poet to which the *Iphigenie* points.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

γ. *Influences.*

Two events occurred in September, 1793, either or both of which may have affected Schlegel's activities: the death of his father on the 16th, and the appearance of Caroline Böhmer in her retreat at Lucha, near Leipzig, where Friedrich came for the first time under her direct personal influence.

a. Father's Death.

It might be assumed that Friedrich kept up his pretense of studying jurisprudence, and purposely avoided classic studies though actually preferring them, because his father wished it and furnished him the financial support. We might then associate the sudden appearance of Greek studies in September, 1793, with this release from parental restraint. This assumption seems even to have some support in the letters. On May 8, 1793, he declares that his parents must give up a plan which they have forced upon him and which has such slight prospects.¹ On February 11, 1792, he calls his legal studies "Frohndienste," but finds it conducive to mental soundness to have this regular work.² He realizes that the elder brother's career is not for him, and a professorship seems out of the question, so he has chosen a career in the civil service, apparently in full rational consent to his parents' wishes.³ When August Wilhelm's literary prospects brighten, the career of Hofmeister seems tempting, and this is the plan which he wishes to substitute for his father's.

This can in no wise be used as a proof of Friedrich's desire to have leisure for classic studies. As we have seen, he neglected jurisprudence and took up with genuine enthusiasm various other things, none of which were even remotely

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

² *Ibid.*, p. 38.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 9 f.

connected with the Greeks. This avoidance of all "trockene Sachen" improves his health and spirits, and his enthusiasm does not indicate submission to a forced lot. The only hateful thing to Friedrich is the prospect of subordination and routine, which must be unendurable to a man whose ideals smack of Prometheus and Faust. "Die lichte Bahn des Ruhmes" is his only course.¹ When his father dies, that important event leaves but the slightest record in the letters; nothing about release or change of plans. He will simply receive less money from home and will expect more from August Wilhelm. That is all. One feels that the change from a civil to a literary career would have been made in spite of his father's wishes. Further, it seems probable that the Greek studies were begun somewhat before the news of the death arrived in Leipzig. Financial straits due to dissipation compel the removal from Leipzig to Dresden, and the Dresden environment, the art collections, and the library favor classic interests.

b. Caroline Böhmer.

The appearance of this gifted lady at Lucha is an altogether different matter. She is one of the remarkable women of all time, if we may trust contemporary judgment and the opinion of that ripe scholar, Haym.² All men whom she met were brought under her spell.

Friedrich's interest in her dates from the spring of 1791, when he learns of her through August Wilhelm, who is then in love with her. We cannot follow the growth of this interest in detail as reflected in the correspondence of more than two years. She is to him a great riddle to whose solu-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

² Ein deutsches Frauenleben aus der Zeit unsrer Litteraturblüte, R. Haym, *Preuss. Jahrb.*, Bd. 28, pp. 457 ff., November 1871.

tion he turns again and again. He reads extracts from her letters, and is astonished at her greatness. He blames her for oracular speech, a tendency to make her superiority felt, and "sich huldigen zu lassen." But ere long she has become "ein Phantom dessen wirkliches Erkennen mir gefährlich sein könnte." It is his pleasure "das grosse Ganze ihres Geistes zu errathen." "Welches Weib! Du Glücklicher!" he exclaims, on another occasion. The actual meeting only heightens these impressions. "Der Eindruck, den sie auf mich gemacht hat, ist viel zu ausserordentlich als dass ich ihn selbst schon deutlich übersehen und mittheilen könnte."¹ At first he feels in danger of expressing himself "schwärmerisch." "Die Überlegenheit ihres Verstandes über den Meinigen habe ich sehr früh gefühlt;" he writes, but can scarcely believe in her frankness, in such artlessness and greatness in a woman. He had not expected to find such "Einfachheit," such "Göttlicher Sinn für Wahrheit." One cannot know her without loving her. Her society is a rich return for what he loses by remaining away from classic Dresden.² At first she was an inexhaustible source from which he learned.³ They talked of literature. As was inevitable, they talked of Goethe. She read *Iphigenie* to him. "B's Urtheile über Poesie sind mir *sehr neu und angenehm*. Sie dringt tief ins Innre, und man hört das auch aus ihrem Lesen, wie die *Iphigenie* liest sie herrlich. Wenn ihr Urtheil *rein* (*i. e.*, impersonal, objective) wäre, so könnte es vielleicht nicht so unaussprechlich wahr und tief sein." "Sie findet Lust an den Griechen, und ich schicke ihr immer einen über den andern."⁴ On November 24 he is enthusiastic in the hope of a triple alliance "Du, Caroline und Ich" which, however, was not to be realized for several

¹ *WSBr.*, p. 98.² *Ibid.*, p. 114.³ *Ibid.*, p. 159.⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

years. After the separation Friedrich writes about her from Dresden : "Carolines Meinung ist seit der letzten Zeit von grossem Werth für mich gewesen ;" "Carolines Theilnahme und Rath ist mir sehr nützlich gewesen, kann es weit mehr sein. Mein Zutrauen zu ihr ist ganz unbedingt. Sie ist nicht mehr die Einzige, die Unerforschliche, von der man nie aufhört zu lernen, sondern die Gute, die Beste, vor der ich mich meiner Fehler schäme."¹ About a month later there is another reference to the *Iphigenie*: as she read it, it approached the melody of the Greeks. "Ich gestehe Dir, dass die Musik dieses Werkes mir der geflügelten Fülle und der kräftigen Zartheit der Alten *nahe zu kommen* scheint."²

We must admit therefore that Caroline exerted a powerful influence upon Friedrich Schlegel. She strengthened his character and moulded his thought. She was a Goethe-worshipper, and remained so when his public had turned from him. She was at one time almost the only Goethe enthusiast in Germany, the only person who appreciated the classic Goethe. It was the *Iphigenie* which she interpreted to Schlegel, and the *new views* of poetry were developed during the interpretation. She identified herself with the heroine "das Land der Griechen mit der Seele suchend" and Schlegel felt all the force of its artistic beauty. It would be no marvel if he too began, from that moment, to seek "das Land der Griechen" in his way.

We have one positive testimony to this influence, though it is embodied in a romance and gains significance only in connection with the whole preceding argument. In Schlegel's *Lucinde* we find a passage beginning: "Die Vergötterung seiner erhabenen Freundin (here certainly Caroline) wurde für seinen Geist ein fester Mittelpunkt und Boden einer neuen Welt," etc. The paragraph, which is important in its

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

² *Ibid.*, p. 171.

entirety, contains the specific confession: "Er vergass sein Zeitalter, und bildete sich nach den Helden der Vorwelt, deren Ruinen er mit Anbetung liebte."¹ Julius is Schlegel himself, and this is a scarcely disguised literary confession of his personal relations to Caroline at Lucha.

To sum up, Caroline opened Schlegel's eyes to the superiority of the classic Goethe over the earlier Storm and Stress Goethe. This directed his attention to the Greeks as a source of inspiration for all great art, especially for modern German art. He now saw that his scholarship might enlist itself in the service of Weimar classicism and produce fruitful results. To be sure he could read Greek already, and had been affected by the general classical movement of Winckelmann and Shaftesbury. The new desire, having been awakened, all these dormant elements must become the basis of his work. He takes advantage as far as possible of the chief works of others. He rereads Herder's *Kritische Wälder*, and Barthélemy's *Anacharsis*, and doubtless Winckelmann. In this way the new ambition drives him on to acquire a mass-knowledge of the Greeks never attained in Germany before his time.

δ. *Traces of Goethe.*

Whether the preceding argument be sound or not, we know that Schlegel had a very deep interest in Goethe's works. His acquaintance with them was very intimate. An interest so intense cannot fail to affect a young man in his formative period.

Such influence is shown in frequency of quotation from most of the great works. How much of Schlegel's interest in German history and the history of Roman law was due to the inspiration of Goethe's *Götz* is not directly determin-

¹ *Luc.*, p. 56.

able. He is particularly interested in Luther, the Reformation, the Peasant Wars, etc. Friedrich's Roman drama was doubtless planned after *Götz*. Schlegel's "daily" thoughts of suicide might be associated with the reading of *Werther*, though the causes may have lain in his own unfortunate mental and physical organization. However his "inner dissonance" is a genuine and definite Wertherian symptom. Possibly, too, the Goethean terms "Fülle" and "Harmonie," used so often in *Werther*, *Faust*, *Stella*, *Tasso*, etc., for ideal excellence of all kinds, may have suggested to Schlegel these æsthetic watchwords. Haym refers them to the Plato studies, but they occur for the first time, and suddenly, upon his first study of the Greek dramatists and Goethe's *Iphigenie*.

In further consideration of this whole problem we must remember that (1) Friedrich did not come into personal contact with Goethe until the second Jena residence after his æsthetic theories had been formulated in the *Athenäum*; that (2) Goethe was not a *theorist* in his art until after 1794 when he had come under Schiller's influence; that (3) no utterances of Goethe on art or literary criticism, *except as contained in his dramas and novels*, were published after about 1773 until the date of the inception of the *Propyläen*, if we neglect the three essays, a notice of Moritz's *Nachahmung des Schönen* made up wholly of excerpts (July, 1787), *Litterarischer Sanskulottismus* (1795), and Mme. de Stael's *Versuch über die Dichtungen* (1796), the first of which only can have fallen into Schlegel's hands in time to affect his views.¹ Thus any direct influence of Goethe upon Schlegel's views of art, philosophy, life, must come from reading and

¹This does not exclude the possibility of access to the *Frankf. Gel. Anzeiger* essays and reviews, and the derivation of earlier Storm and Stress ideas from them and from *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst*, though we have no direct testimony to such access.

rereading the published literary works. The results will naturally be less specific than those in the case of Kant, Schiller, and Fichte.

Schlegel read carefully, with an eye to the character of the poet, and constantly tried to reconstruct him from his confessions. The works of Goethe were constantly used for the purpose of deriving æsthetic laws. These two facts are patent.

Another source of influence, secondary and but slight, was correspondence, rumor from mouth to mouth, etc. In Leipzig Schlegel stood in relations with Göschen, and we know that this was a source of much literary information. In Dresden he was intimate with Körner, who was in constant correspondence with Schiller and Humboldt. Schlegel was not lacking in impertinent curiosity, and Körner told him many things, even showed him letters from both authors. Schiller's letters often contained hints of Goethe's artistic principles, which might have become fruitful in Friedrich's thought.

Schlegel's own personality will therefore condition the form in which Goethean influences appear.

One of the most striking things in Goethe's early works is his treatment of *Nature*. In *Werther* it is unavoidable. We know that this feature impressed Schlegel deeply.¹ For him it was *Werther's* chief characteristic.² In *Faust* he was impressed by the treatment of *Nature*,³ especially its Spinozism, its tendency to mysticism. There is enough in *Werther*, *Faust*, and the lyrics to force a recognition of nature in any system of æsthetics derived from them as concrete models. Compare the passage beginning "Das volle warme Gefühl meines Herzens an der lebendigen Natur," etc. (*Werther*, August 18). How he grasps "das innre

¹ MS., Bd. II, p. 82.

² *Ib.*, p. 378.

³ WSB., p. 1.

glühende heilige Leben der Natur" in his own warm heart! How he feels the breath of the "Geist des Ewigschaffenden" that rejoices in the minutest forms of life! How he longs to feel in his bosom one drop of the bliss of the being "das alles in sich und durch sich hervorbringt!" Or compare the passage beginning "Kannst du sagen: *Das ist*" (*Ibid.*). This all-creating, rejoicing nature takes on its destructive aspect as an "ewig-verschlingendes, ewig-wiederkäuendes Ungeheuer."

The mood of sympathy between the soul and nature finds noble expression in the Faust-fragment of 1790. "Erhabener Geist, du gabst mir, gabst mir alles warum ich bat," etc.¹ The pantheistic element is present also in this scene. Faust speaks of "dieser Wonne, die mich den Göttern nah und näher bringt."² Mephisto joins both elements in his satires.³ For the pantheistic element, especially for the identification of God and man, compare the catechetical scene,⁴ or the words of the *Geist* "In Lebensfluthen," etc.⁵ For the organic nature and harmony of the universe we have the famous passage from which Schlegel's motto was taken: "Wie sich alles zum Ganzen webt," etc.⁶

Dr. Alfred Biese, who discusses Goethe's *Naturanschauung* in this early period, using the lyrics also as materials, sums up in substance as follows: (1) It was a pantheistic identification of the fulness of nature with God; (2) a sympathy of nature with the human soul, both being profoundly in harmony, so much so indeed that there is nothing in the one which has not its answering counterpart in the other; (3) Goethe's attitude toward nature is not predominantly the idyllic one of escape from the corruptions of

¹ Faustfragment of 1790, ll. 1890-1912.

² *Ibid.*, ll. 1914-5.

³ *Ibid.*, ll. 1955-64.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ll. 1734-61.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ll. 148-156.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ll. 94-106.

culture and artificiality, but the more profound one of self-identification with nature and God, since these and man are at heart *all one*. According to Biese this is the *distinctive* feature in Goethe's treatment of nature, his *advance* upon Rousseau and Klopstock, the two highest representatives of the nature cult preceding him.¹ Dilthey vindicates the view of nature as a *living organic whole* as Goethe's special contribution to the *Weltanschauung* of his own and succeeding generations.²

But Goethe's works were full of nature, life. Every character was alive, as if stolen bodily from nature. They were not mere outlines of being, mere abstractions given a sort of rhetorical life by personification, but concrete products with all the fulness of reality. They could be intuited. They formed a picture for the imagination and in this respect were a remarkable advance upon all previous poetic art of recent times.

Besides, Goethe's works are not wanting here and there in expressions of artistic principles which illumine his apparent practices. Compare *Werther* (May 10), the passage beginning "Ich bin so glücklich, mein Bester," etc. When his soul is full of nature, full of God, he is a great painter, though he could not sketch a line, and he exclaims: "Ach! könntest du das wieder ausdrücken, könntest dem Papier das einhauchen, was so voll, so warm in dir lebt, dass es würde der Spiegel deiner Seele, wie deine Seele ist der Spiegel des unendlichen Gottes!" Or again (May 26), when Werther sketches the children in a natural group: "Das bestärkte mich in meinem Vorsatze, mich künftig allein an die Natur zu halten. Sie allein ist unendlich reich, und sie allein bildet den grossen Künstler." This is also true of poetry, he says elsewhere (May 30), but adds the

¹ *Preuss. Jahrb.*, Bde. 59-60.

² *DLS.*, pp. 96 and 170.

necessary warning that nature is not always *artistic*: she is not typically perfect at every moment in all places: "Es ist nur, dass man das Vortreffliche erkenne und es auszusprechen wage." He has just seen such an instance, which "rein abgeschrieben" would be the most beautiful idyl in the world (*Ibid.*). Compare also the famous *dicta* of Faust.¹ The art which compels all hearts must come with an inner necessity out of a glowing heart, and without any artificial restraints.

We have seen that Goethe's realism keeps clear of mere naturalism. The selection of typically perfect scenes from nature, "das Erkennen des Vortrefflichen," is idealization. This selective treatment was also accorded to historic themes and persons, as is patent to all in *Götz*, *Egmont*, and *Tasso*. That such personalities were often used as mouthpieces for the poet's own thought and feeling, his own deepest problems and firmest convictions, was equally apparent in the "Faust-fragment" and the *Prometheus*.

Let us now turn to Friedrich Schlegel's utterances in the letters. We have first his profession of interest in nature, and his conversion from a previous distaste for it, made in connection with a quotation from *Faust*.² But he is too subjective to maintain long any great enthusiasm for external nature. He turns rather to human problems, to history, philosophy, art, and we shall find Goethe's influence greatest here. Nevertheless one remarkable passage occurs: "Grosse Männer! Lasst euch zu der hellen Einsicht herunter, und verständigt sie, was nennt ihr Natur? Etwa alle einzelne Dinge, so vorhanden sind? Oder die Seele des Alls? Das mächtige Leben, das in allem, was entsteht und untergeht, seine eigene, unendliche Fülle, in wechselnder Liebe und wechselndem Kampfe mit sich selbst, ewig verschlingt?"

¹ Faust fragment of 1790, ll. 181-92 and 197-8.

² *WSBr.*, p. 1.

Ihr ahndet im heiligen Dunkel nicht ein unendliches Nichts, sondern *ewige Quellen vergänglichem Lebens? Wir auch!* Oft scheint es, als meintet ihr alle Regungen des Menschlichen Herzens in ihrer Üppigkeit und Ausschweifungen. Wir brauchen aber unsrer edelsten Kraft nicht zu entsagen. Wir dürfen auch ohne das innere Eintracht hoffen? Ist denn Vernunft etwas andres als höheres Leben?"¹

The first portion of this passage is a condensed scheme of Goethe's *Anschauung* with all warmth of feeling omitted. The latter is a confused recognition of the parallelism of man and nature with *Vernunft* as the unifying, harmonizing principle in man, as the *Seele des Alls* is the unifying element in Nature.

Beauty is *nature*, not human *selection*. Thus he begins his first æsthetic treatise, May, 1793 :—²

"In einem dichterischen Kunstwerke muss die *Ordnung* richtig und schön sein, der *Stoff* wahr, und die *Ausführung* gut."

"Es giebt nur zwei *Gesetze* für die Dichtkunst. Eines derselben ist—das Mannigfaltige muss zu *innrer Einheit* *notwendig* verknüpft sein. Zu einem muss alles hinwirken, und aus diesem einem, jedes andren Dasein, Stelle, Bedeutung *notwendig* folgen." This unity is often deep hidden. In *Hamlet* it is the prince's mood, his whole view of the purpose of man. In *Götz* it is the German knightly spirit, its last effort to rise before it is extinguished. With *Götz* dies ancient virtue and the age of heroes. Shakespeare's *Romeo* has unity, but our critic has not yet been able to investigate it. In *Don Carlos* he has sought in vain for it.

"Ohne *Natureinheit* und *Vernunfteinheit* ist die höchste Schönheit der Ordnung unmöglich." No chaotic subject

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 86 ff.

can be really unified, but even naturally unified subject matter can become an artistic unity only through the free activity of the *Vernunft*. This is doubtless a derivative from Goethe's practices as we have seen. The *Vernunft* also decides upon the lesser divisions of a work of art. These lesser divisions should flow together like waves and not disturb the continuity of the whole. This is really directed against all types of regular stanza, a series of which cannot form a natural organic whole. This is to be associated with Friedrich's marked preference for Goethe's free rhythms.

Truth requires *depth* and *likeness to nature*. To the first Goethe, Schiller, and Klopstock (he recognizes no others) have equal claims. Their relations to the second are unlike. "Ehe der Geist mit der Natur eins ist" (intended to characterize Goethe) "wirkt es zu sehr nur *aus sich* und *aus seinen Begriffen*; weiss nicht sich *dem Wirklichen anzuschmiegen*." This is Schiller's condition. "Wenige nur vernehmen den leisen Gang der Natur in der Zeit." This is Goethe's excellence. He knows the world and several passions well. Klopstock is especially successful in catching the notes of the inner life.

The characteristic of the poet is "Trieb zur Darstellung," but it must be a representation of poetic materials. His perfection is "die allgemeine Fähigkeit alles gut darzustellen." He adds specially that this seems to have been Goethe's intention. Indeed, Schlegel insisted later that some of Goethe's poems were products of this form-instinct alone, pure form-poems without content.

But a poem, to deserve the praise of those who alone are competent judges, must be more than *formally* perfect, it must have "einen grossen Gehalt." Only the self-active human spirit and its deeds have worth in themselves. "Je menschlicher, je würdiger" is Schlegel's *dictum*, and we know that Goethe's poems are for him the great examples of

perfect form with great content. Greatness of heart was ascribed to Werther, and Faust was a great man in contrast to Klinger's *Faust*.

It is hardest to judge of the content of a poem. There is, however, only one unconditional law, "*Vernunftseinheit*," ideal unity, or as he formulates it, "*dass der freie Geist stets siege über die Natur*." This is difficult, he admits, at the close of epic or dramatic works.

There is not only a type of poetry for each age, people, rank, but for each individual. Yet the more individual, the less intelligible to the world at large. The poets generally compose only for themselves, and yet for the great number of them it remains an eternal truth, "*wer für die Welt lebt, in dessen Herzen muss Raum sein für eine Welt*." This must be compared with the later claims of universality for Goethe's poetry.

Only Shakespeare, Goethe, Klopstock, Schiller, and Wieland are considered in this first aesthetic sketch. It is apparent that he is working out his principles from the works of these authors, among whom Goethe bears the chief part.

This sketch was intended merely as a statement of the most general laws of poetry, according to which a critic might pass valid judgments upon any given poem. For the poet himself "*giebt's keine Gesetze*."¹ He is a creative genius, and a law unto himself. This is still Storm and Stress. These laws are only for the critic.

A passage in reply to certain restrictions of August Wilhelm brings out more fully Friedrich's conception of the artistic unity of a poem. The *Seele* or *Herz* of a poem is what we call *Geist* in man, *Gott* in creation, *i. e.*, "*lebendigster Zusammenhang*"—organic unity. Here occurs also

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

a passage remarkable for its relation to Moritz's thought. "Es giebt nur ein wirkliches System, die grosse verborgene, die ewige Natur, oder die Wahrheit."¹

This represents the height of Schlegel's aesthetics before his meeting with Caroline and his entrance upon Greek studies. In the following December utterances occur which show a change. The "Vernunftseinheit" which he now calls "poetische Sittlichkeit" is the product of the poet alone, a demand of art, not a gift of nature. The definition of the nature of the poet is now changed to "Harmonie innrer Fülle," which accords well with a deepened insight into *Iphigenie* and *Tasso*. The essential attitude of the poet is an instinct for the consciousness of this inner fulness in harmony. The external manifestation is as before: "Trieb zur Darstellung." Shortly after this the influences of Kant and especially of Schiller make themselves felt in his essays.

When Schlegel goes to the Greeks, it is to the *dramatists*, not to Homer. This is in accordance with our assumption that he proceeds from the *Iphigenie*, but is explainable perhaps equally well on other grounds. Yet it remains psychologically impossible for Schlegel to have gone to the study of the Greeks without taking with him pretty fully developed notions of the drama. These were formed chiefly from Goethe's practice. Hence we are somewhat justified in suspecting a transference of Goethean qualities into the Greeks when Friedrich finds perfect harmony in Sophocles, and declares that tragedy best where "das Herz der siegende Gott ist," in the contest with fate.

Few other traces remain to be noted. Friedrich's masterly sophistic defense of lying² may be a reminiscence of

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 111. Cf. also *MNack.*, p. 14, *et passim*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 62.

Mephisto's sophisms.¹ His notions of Genius and its relation to rules and regulations of life not only are akin to Goethe's Storm and Stress ideas, but their expression shows close similarity: "wir verstehen aber denke ich darunter (*i. e.*, Fehlerlosigkeit) ein mittleres Mass an allen Seelenkräften, ein Mensch, der es besitzt, lebt recht ordentlich und anständig, ist ziemlich liebenswürdig, ziemlich klug, und thut das, was die Menge mit Verehrung nennt. Er schweift also nirgends sehr ab, stösst nie an; mit einem Worte, er hat so etwas der Tugend Ähnliches, in kritischen Fällen muss ihm der liebe Gott helfen. Er ist alles, was ein gewöhnlicher Mensch sein kann. Die Bildner der Menschen haben ihre Einrichtungen, als Staaten und Religionen, und in kleinen Kreisen, Gewohnheiten und Cursivmoralen, an die man glaubt durch Ehre und Schande, nach den allgemeinen Eigenschaften der Klasse recht sehr gut gemacht, nur die Menschen unschädlich, und doch auch ein klein wenig gut zu machen. Für gewöhnliche Menschen verdient daher der Inbegriff dieser Eigenschaften, welchen du Fehlerlosigkeit oder Rechtlichkeit nennen kannst, alle mögliche Empfehlung, und lass uns ja *das Genie nicht machen wollen*. Das wahre Genie kann sich nicht in diesen fremden Massstab fügen, bald überspringt es ihn weit, bald bleibt es zurück."²

When he adds that genius is the *æterna fons* of life, and that the few geniuses are a class of beings who have nothing in common with other mortals, he has certainly Goethe's personality in mind. But compare the above passage with that of *Werther* (May 26), "man kann zum Vortheile der Regeln viel sagen," etc., and the kinship is at once apparent.

Hence, of this first period we may say: (1) until the summer of 1793, Schlegel was dominated by Storm and Stress ideas; (2) Goethe and his works were the dominant influ-

¹ Faust fragment of 1790, ll. 1464-1500.

² *WSBr.*, p. 5.

ence; (3) through the personal influence of Caroline Böhmer his taste and appreciation for Goethe's classic manner were awakened September, 1793; (4) this induced Friedrich to turn to the Greeks in support of Weimar classicism; (5) he carried into the study of the Greeks subjective elements derived from Goethe; and (6) this study of the Greeks reacted upon his estimate of Goethe and caused him to place the latter in the center of all ideal poetry, and made his works the canon of all poetic art.

B. 1794-1802.

1. *Dresden, Publications.*

Friedrich Schlegel's public career began in November, 1794. The first recorded recognition of him by the Weimar poets is in a letter of Schiller to Goethe, August 8, 1796. He writes, "Schlegel's Bruder ist hier: er macht einen recht guten Eindruck und verspricht viel." To this Goethe makes no reply. Goethe could have had access to the journals in which Friedrich's essays appeared, but we have no record of his reading them or caring to read them.

The essays here meant are the following: "Von den Schulen der Griechischen Poesie," *Berlin. Monatschrift*, November, 1794; "Über die Weiblichen Charaktere in den Griechischen Dichtern," *Leipzig. Monatschrift für Damen*, October and November, 1794; "Vom ästhetischen Werthe der Griechischen Komödie," *Berlin. Monatschrift*, December, 1794; "Über die Grenzen des Schönen," *Wieland's Teutscher Merkur*, May, 1795; "Über die Diotima," *Berlin. Monatschrift*, July and August, 1795; review of Condorcet's "Esquisse d'un tableau historique," etc., *Niethammer's Journal*, III, 2, 1795; review of "Schiller's Musenalmanach für 1796," *Deutschland*, June, 1796; review of "Schiller's

Horen, Stücke II-V," *Deutschland*, July, 1796; "Goethe, ein Fragment" from his *Studium*, also selected passages from his *Studium der Griechischen Poesie*, a work which he hoped soon to lay before the German public.

The most important of these was perhaps the first, which shows the influence of Winckelmann, Herder, Humboldt and Schiller.¹ The tendency to look upon Greek life and poetry as a natural organic whole may be referable to Goethe.² The other essays do not betray Goethe's influence noticeably. Dr. Carl Alt³ has shown that they are æsthetic descendants of Schiller's earlier essays. They are thus pendants of Weimar classicism in a large sense, but not directly related to Goethe. The *Diotima* alone makes reference to Goethe. Here Goethe and Shakespeare are mentioned as the greatest masters in the delineation of feminine characters. Their women are richer for the understanding but not more beautiful or delicate than those of Homer, the "Ionic Bard."

To most of these essays we shall pay no attention. They are easily accessible in Minor's edition and their contents are analyzed by Haym. We shall consider only those which offer materials for the problem in hand.

We must, however, note the personal relations of Friedrich. He needed a publisher in order to live. His ambition was scarcely satisfied with less than the best organ, which at that time was Schiller's *Horen*. But two things stood in the way. The need of this journal for classic contributions was already supplied by Wilhelm v. Humboldt, and Schiller was pleased neither with Schlegel's character, whom he called "einen unbescheidnen kalten Witzling,"⁴ nor with his literary ability, about which anyone might be justly scepti-

¹ *HRS.*, p. 187 ff.

² *DLS.*, pp. 96 and 170.

³ Alt. *Schiller und die Brüder Schlegel.*

⁴ *WSBr.*, p. 45.

cal. One essay was refused and there now seemed to be no other opportunity of entering the charmed circle of the organ of the Weimar classicists. Schlegel turned to Reichardt, whose *Deutschland* was opened to him. Now Reichardt happened to be in a feud with Goethe and Schiller, and gladly made Schlegel the cat's paw in taking revenge. The latter was already unfriendly to Schiller, and had been rendered more so by Caroline, the dominant spirit of the Jena circle which he was soon to enter. The purpose of this Jena coterie seems to have been to separate the great poet friends, to reduce Schiller, to place Goethe on the highest pinnacle of fame, and to establish its members as literary dictators. Such a program pleased Friedrich and he readily lent himself as the foremost instrument in carrying it out.

The first blow in this campaign was the review of Schiller's *Musen Almanach für 1796*. Having developed from Schiller his theory of objectivity as the essential of all art,¹ he now makes application of it to concrete cases. He has no respect for persons. With dictatorial mien he assumes the judge's chair, and the higher the master the sterner and more searching the criticism. He has not yet provided himself with the *Filzschuhe* of his later years. He does not shrink from insult if it only seem witty enough.

In the review praise and blame are mingled, but in unequal proportions. The epigrams are so numerous and excellent, he says in substance, that a complete theory of this kind of poetry might be developed from them. Schiller's *Kolumbus* is one of the finest. *Der Tanz* is too long, and too earnest. It has no poetic unity and combines the prolixity of Ovid with the heaviness of Propertius. The elegy is not at all adapted to Schiller's quick fire and terse strength. Schiller in his prime knew better how to choose

¹ Alt, pp. 25 f.

and strike the proper tone than now since his long sojourn in historical and philosophical fields. Would he have pardoned himself such a work as *Pegasus* then? For comic poems are uninteresting unless they have original joyousness, wit, grace, and urbanity. So many phrases, so many offenses. But, he adds, this must not disturb any one's satisfaction in Schiller's return from the subterranean vaults of metaphysics into the light of day as a poet. The *Ideale* will win him friends. The *Macht des Gesanges* is disfigured by incorrect figures of speech. The *Würde der Frauen* is monotonous and wholly lacking in taste. It is not a poem at all. It gains by reading it strophe by strophe backwards. The characters are not realistic, but idealized downwards beneath the truth. "Männer wie diese müssten an Händen und Beinen gebunden werden; solchen Frauen ziemte Gängelband und Fallhut."¹ The more detailed analysis of the *Ideale* merely brings out personal abuse of Schiller.²

The treatment of Goethe is quite different. *Der Besuch* pleases Schlegel best. *Meeresstille* is very attractive, but must be read in connection with the text from which it is taken, in order to have its due effect. "Die Epigramme, in denen der grösste Dichter unsrer Zeit unverkennbar ist, sind in der That eine Rolle reichlich mit Leben ausgeschmückt, voll der lieblichsten Würzen." This spice resembles most the fresh salt found only too sparingly in Martial. In one of the epigrams "athmet eine zarte Griechheit, und überall jener echtdeutsche, unschuldige, gleichsam kindliche Mutwillen, von dem sich in einigen epischen Stücken der Griechen etwas Gleiches findet." The chief point of the whole review, however, is summed up in a paragraph which compares Goethe and Schiller, but denies the justice of making such a comparison.

The review of the *Horen II-V* was less insulting to

¹ *MS.*, Bd. II, p. 4.

² *Ibid.*

the editor but less favorable to the contents. August Wilhelm's contributions are generously praised, while Schiller's aesthetic essay is barely mentioned. Goethe's translation of *Benvenuto Cellini* is too long and monotonous for such a journal. The chief attention of the reviewer is devoted to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The exegesis in *Wilhelm Meister* had pleased the elder brother very highly, but Friedrich himself had brooded over *Hamlet* and reached other results. Goethe was in part mistaken. A critic must not be merely an exegete, must not merely account for the existence of a work of art, but must pass upon its merits as art. The critic must not merely appreciate the beauties of a piece, but be able "gültige Grundsätze richtig anzuwenden." This was Goethe's fault. He took licenses with *Hamlet*. "Goethe schwelgt zu sehr im Genusse seines vollendet schönen Selbst, als dass er die schreienden Härten, die empörenden Nacktheiten des zu aufrichtigen Shakespeare ertragen könnte und sich nicht verhüllen müsste. *Er ist auch wohl zu sehr Dichter*, als dass er sich seiner Schöpferkraft ganz entäussern und mit der treuen Enthaltksamkeit eines bescheidenen Forschers die Werke eines andern Dichters erklären könnte."¹ No critic is more unsafe than a poet himself. Goethe's harmonious soul could hardly understand the sublime despair of *Hamlet*. "Wie Goethe den *Werther* schrieb, da ersetzte jenen Mangel die Jugend, ihre wehmüthigen Ahnungen, ihre weissagenden Thränen. Nachher liess ihn das Geschick, zu nachsichtig, mit seinem Genius allein."

Faust and *Hamlet* are now compared. The passage is too long for citation, but indicates a purely Storm and Stress conception of *Faust*. It closes: "Hamlet muss seiner Natur nach langsam vergehen, und wie von selbst aufhören; Faust

¹ *Ibid.*, Bd. II, p. 11 f.

hingegen muss mit Krachen zur Hölle hinabstürzen. Das ist denn freilich prächtiger und auch poetischer." But "um die Ausführung Klopstockisch zu vergleichen, so dürfen wir, wenn wir die Kraft und Kunst, welche den Hamlet vollendete, auf hundert schätzen, die, welche den Faust entwarf, nicht wohl über sieben ansetzen."

This must have proven a fine introduction into the good graces of Goethe, but fortunately a more extraordinary essay had preceded it. This was *Goethe, ein Fragment*, which had immediately won for its author the reputation of an unconditional and blinded eulogist of Goethe's poetry. It begins: "Der Charakter der ästhetischen Bildung unseres Zeitalters und unsrer Nation verräth sich selbst durch ein merkwürdiges und grosses Symptom. Goethens Poesie ist die Morgenröthe echter Kunst und reiner Schönheit," etc.¹ Few extracts can be made from all Schlegel's writings in which such extravagant and sustained eulogy occur. The central idea is that the beautiful is the true standard of Goethe's work. Its character is objectivity. And yet the poet is not strictly objective but stands midway between the objective and the characteristic. For this reason he is the artist of the future. "Dieser grosse Künstler eröffnet die Aussicht auf eine ganz neue Stufe der ästhetischen Bildung." The objective, the beautiful, is no empty illusion, but a reality, because here realized.

The whole panegyric contains little else than what we have already seen in the correspondence of Friedrich. The increased enthusiasm is due to the appearance of Goethe's recent brilliant performances, his Roman elegies, Venetian epigrams, and *Wilhelm Meister*. The letters are full of expressions of it. "Was sagst Du zu den Göttlichen Elegien?" "Was sagst Du zum Göttlichen Wilhelm?" "Sage und singe mir ein schönes, feines und langes Lied

¹ *Ibid.*, Bd. I, p. 114 ff.

davon.”¹ Other expressions of interest in Goethe occur. “Ich freue mich herzlich auf deine Ergiessungen über Shakespeare und Goethe.”² This refers to the essay on Shakespeare and Wilhelm Meister reviewed later by Friedrich in *Deutschland*. “Ich habe grosse Lust ein paar Blätter über die harmonische Ausbildung und Goethe und Politik hineinzugeben” in the opposition papers against the reviewers of the *Horen*, I and II, which contained Goethe’s elegies, epigrams, and epistles.³ “Das Stück Künstlerroman (Benvenuto Cellini), welches man deinem Shakespeare zugesellt hat, gefällt mir köstlich. Goethe muss die Hände im Spiel gehabt haben. Es gefällt mir millionenmal besser als Märchen und Ausgewanderte.”⁴ “Über alles bin ich auf deine Bekanntschaft mit Goethe begierig.”⁵ “Sehr schön ist’s, dass Du mit Goethe so gut bist, und alles, was Du von ihm schreibst, hat mich höchlich ergötzt.”⁶

All in all, then, we are not forced to assume that the public praise of this “Fragment” was overwrought for the purpose of lifting himself and establishing a school. Friedrich’s admiration of Goethe is of too early origin, and exaggeration too firmly ingrained in his nature, to compel such a conclusion. But it is not impossible, nor improbable, that he considered it a most fortunate situation to be able to turn his honest enthusiasm to literary profit. He had always desired to stand well with Goethe, though his admiration had not been wholly unmixed. “Ihr seid so wunderlich,” he writes to the Jena circle, December 23, 1795, “dass ihr mich dahin bringen könntet, eine Satire wider Goethe zu schreiben;” and a little earlier: “Auch Goethe’s Leichtigkeit ist oft die Frucht von unsäglichem Fleiss und grosser Anstrengung.”⁷ Of late, however, this tendency to finding fault had been overcome.

¹ *WSBr.*, p. 231.² *Ibid.*, p. 270.³ *Ibid.*, p. 275.⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 276.⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 279.⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 280.⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

2. *Jena.*a. *Xenienkampf.*

When now Friedrich arrived in Jena, in August, 1796, Goethe and Schiller had already nearly completed the preparation of those remarkable distichs, the *Xenia*, which were soon to interest and alarm the whole literary and journalistic world of Germany. The plan, suggested by Goethe, December 23, 1795, and approved at once by Schiller, began as a reply to the enemies of the *Horen*, a simple satirical volley at the various journals of the day, but grew larger and more inclusive from time to time, until it promised to become a vast manifesto of a thousand distichs against all tendencies not in harmony with Weimar classicism.

It is no part of our task here to follow this development in detail. The production of *Xenia* continued up to the last moment before the last sheets of the *Musenalmanach für 1797* went to press. Goethe and Schiller were together in daily conference from the middle of August until the first week in October. During this period the collection received its final form, was reduced to half its volume, and published.

During this period of daily coöperation Schlegel's review of their *Almanach* came to the eyes of Goethe and Schiller. There appeared also selected passages from Friedrich's *Studium*, with their paradoxes and exaggerations. We have no record of the reception of the works, and no comment upon their contents, for the correspondence ceased in August. A most valuable index of Goethe's attitude toward Schlegel is thus wanting. All is left to inference.

Schlegel had begun to regret his folly before he set out for Jena, but Körner's letter to Schiller in Friedrich's behalf arrived too late with its assurances that the poet had no greater admirer than this same foolhardy young critic. The

excuses, moreover, were insufficient. The public praise of Goethe and degradation of Schiller seemed an effort to alienate the friends. At any rate it was an unwarranted piece of insolence from a mere upstart in letters. It was also a type of literary and æsthetic mischief which deserved a heavy hand. There was still time to remember the belated guest with a due number of the spiciest gifts.

The Schlegels had already been remembered by two distichs, *Frage* (484)¹ and *Antwort* (485), which recognized their services in the contest against Nikolai and the Philistines. These were now given an unfavorable turn before publication. Their bolts fall still upon the Trojans, but often also "blind ins Blaue hinein."

Another *Xenion* (501) of the great *Underworld Cycle* was now given the title *Pure Manier* to satirize Friedrich's published *dictum* that Shakespeare is "nie objectiv," but "durchgängig maniert."² Possibly No. 500, with its *Geschrei der Tragöden* and *Hundegebell der Dramaturgen* around the shade of Shakespeare may apply to Friedrich, though more probably only to the earlier Shakespearians, J. E. Schlegel, Böttiger, Wieland, and Eschenburg.

The real attack upon Friedrich begins with No. 826 (302), *Neueste Kritikproben*, and consists of an unbroken series to No. 844 (331), in all nineteen epigrams, including the following titles: *Eine Zweite*, *Eine Dritte*, *Schillers Würde der Frauen*, *Pegasus von demselben*, *Das unglückliche Verhältnis*, *Neugier*, *Die Zwei Fieber*, *Griechheit*, *Warnung*, *Übertreibung und Einseitigkeit*, *Neueste Behauptung*, *Griechische und Moderne Tragödie*, *Entgegengesetzte Wirkung*, *Die höchste Harmonie*, *Aufgelöstes Rätsel*, *Gefährliche Nachfolge*, *Geschwindschreiber*, and *Sonntagskinder*, most of which left little doubt in regard to the victim.

¹ These all refer to the numbers in *SSXen*.

² *MS.*, Bd. I, p. 109.

The first three are examples of Goethe's proposed manner of self-characterization. They would say of themselves simply what "die albernern Burschen" say of them.¹ No. 826 refers to Schlegel's brutal comment on Schiller: "die einmal zerrüttete Gesundheit der Einbildungskraft ist unheilbar."² No. 827 is a similar paradox in defense of Herder's *Epigrams*.³ No. 828 is a reproof of Schlegel's statement that Goethe was always natural even at the risk of becoming trivial and uninteresting.⁴ The following two apply the same method to individual poems unjustly censured by Schlegel. Nos. 831 and 832 contrast the unproductivity or bad literary quality of the Schlegels with their dictatorial assumptions. The next nine distichs bring into ludicrous juxtaposition a number of Schlegel's utterances on the nature of Greek art, its contrast to modern art, etc., etc., charge him with "Graecomanie," with utter failure to appreciate the "Masz" and "Klarheit" of the Greeks, warn him from making the cause of classicism a laughing-stock through his excesses, and point out several instances of grossly incorrect judgment in his essays. Finally the desire of the brothers to become teachers at once, before they have had time to become masters, is sternly rebuked.

The great number of these *Xenia*, only exceeded by those of Reichardt and Nikolai, has been readily explained by some as due to Schiller's personal animosity. Schiller was offended, and justly, too, but there is another side to this question. Schlegel's works were *programmatic*. They outlined a vast work in a most promising field in the most immediate relations with Weimar classicism. They made vast promises which would assure their author an honorable place in the world of scholarship and letters, if *well* fulfilled. If *ill* done, these works might cast reproach upon the whole

¹ *GSBr.*, December 30, 1795.

² *MS.*, Bd. II, p. 6.

³ *Bern.*, Bd. II, pp. 224 ff.

⁴ *MS.*, Bd. II, p. 6.

classic movement. Schiller saw this, felt that Schlegel would play a leading rôle, if at all possible, and therefore decided upon a thorough castigation of his earliest follies and imperfections. It was as the type of literary revolution that Schlegel was attacked.

What now is Goethe's share in all this? These *Xenia* have been attributed with remarkable unanimity to Schiller. Goethe cannot be proved to be the author of any one of them. Schiller's style seems manifest in most of them, but this alone is no safe criterion. Even if we assume that Goethe is not the author of any single *Xenion* against Friedrich, the following facts are still to be considered: 1) Goethe and Schiller intended to keep the authorship *secret*; both intended that each should republish the whole collection *as his own work*. This demonstrates Goethe's intention to accept responsibility for the whole; he subscribed to the Schlegel satire as readily as Schiller to the Reichardt cycle: 2) Schiller constantly urged Goethe to strike out mercilessly any *Xenion* which *for any reason* might seem inadvisable, and Schiller performed the same office for Goethe. Certainly this mutual criticism did not cease while the poets were in daily conference during August and September. The retention of a score of blows at Schlegel in the final collection, when over half the original number were condemned to privacy, seems to imply a mutual belief in their justice and importance: 3) Goethe's statement to Eckermann that he often furnished the idea and Schiller the expression and *vice versa*, that he sometimes composed the hexameter and Schiller the pentameter and *vice versa*, has always been regarded as excellent testimony.¹ But when can this have occurred if not when both poets were in *daily personal communication*? The correspondence shows nothing but exchange of masses of *Xenia*, *complete* and having the

¹ *GGE.*, December 16, 1828.

single authorship of Goethe or Schiller. Those against Schlegel were composed at a time favorable to such mutual composition: 4) Goethe urged that nothing should be published which might give offense in *their own circle*. Thus Herder and Wieland escaped, though there was occasion enough to satirize both. Hence the Schlegels could not have been recognized as of their circle: 5) finally those distichs were not all directed against sharp treatment of Schiller, but two of them at least were against equally senseless treatment of Goethe. The majority were against ridiculous passages in Schlegel's essay, which, if unchallenged, might react against the good cause of classicism, which Goethe had more at heart than had Schiller himself.

β. Results, Continued Reviews.

Friedrich was stung. He attributed the whole attack to Schiller, and considered it an expression of personal hatred. Goethe was wholly exonerated. To Böttiger he likened the poets to a giant walking arm in arm with a dwarf, and Schiller especially to lame Hephaestus attempting to imitate the natural movements of Hebe. As late as 1802 (April 1) he sent five pitifully absurd epigrams against Schiller to Rahel in Berlin for private circulation,¹ while he sang Goethe's praises in private and in public.

Friedrich's utterances were not confined to private circles, however. He gave the *Xenien Almanach* a spicy review in Reichardt's *Deutschland*, in which the *Xenia* figured as like that Vergilian monster "*fama, malum qua non aliud velocius ullum*," etc. The reviewer chooses a simple device to let them characterize themselves, by quoting about a dozen distichs in immediate succession without comment. Here follows a characteristically Schlegelian passage in which the

¹ *BXen.*, Bd. II, p. 226.

Xenia figure as "klassische Grobheiten" not wholly in place, sometimes betraying base hatred, and not even sparing the grave of a noble unfortunate. Friedrich takes up the challenge to the *Chorizonten*, "*Die Aufgabe*," and declares it is Schiller's voice, who rejoices in the fact that in his anonymity he can be mistaken for Goethe. The passage ends with the prophecy "Heuer spanisches Pfeffer, übers Jahr *asa foetida*."¹

In all this Friedrich assumes a very knowing attitude, as if he had certain knowledge not accessible to less favored persons. This manner was favored by his reputation outside Jena and Weimar as the herald of Goethe's preëminence in art. To those who did not know better Schlegel seemed to enjoy the most intimate personal acquaintance with his idol. His utterances must therefore have a sort of *ex cathedra* authority in the world of letters. Ridiculous enough, but certainly true. Goethe complained of it to Schiller, and explained it to Wieland as inevitable. Fräulein von Schimmelmann could not believe in Goethe's moral character because of this assumed intimacy with the Schlegels. When Friedrich assured Reichardt that Goethe had not written the *Xenia* against him, he believed it unquestioningly and wrote Schiller at once demanding information respecting their authorship.

All this supposed intimacy has absolutely no foundation at this date, as shown by the above blunder in respect to Reichardt and by his error in solving the *Aufgabe*, which is by Goethe himself. Schlegel played the rôle of "Gelehrter Geck" in his review. As a prophet he was equally unsuccessful, for it was Schiller who opposed a repetition of the attack and proposed to shame their adversaries by publishing the beautiful *Balladenalmanach* for 1798, and

¹ *MS.*, Bd. II, p. 32.

then excluded from it *Oberon und Titanens Hochzeit* with its literary satires.

It may be noted in passing that the distich became a favorite form of epigram for Friedrich,¹ though their contents smacked more of the *Sudelköche* than of the *Xenia*.

The essay on *Georg Forster* was called out by the *Xenia*. Its democratic tone, as we have noted, wrote its author completely out of favor with Goethe.

However, there were other things beside the *Xenia* in the *Musenalmanach* for 1797, and these offered excellent opportunity for paying off old scores. It contained no less a masterpiece than *Alexis und Dora*. Friedrich greets this with an unbounded enthusiasm which excuses all imperfections or turns them into supreme excellences. It is an idyl in the true Greek sense, with a mingling of "epischer Fülle und lyrischer Glut." "Das Gedicht athmet den ganzen Frühling, oder vielmehr, es athmet zugleich das frische Leben des Frühlings, die mächtige Glut des Sommers, und die reife Milde des Herbstes."

However this is not mere public glorification. His private words are even more enthusiastic. "Gestern war ein Götterfest für mich," he writes, June 15, 1796: "Ich las die *Idylle*. Nur einmal, aber wenn es auch das einzigmal bliebe, so würde sie nie aus meinem Gedächtnis verlöschen. Es hat mich mit Entzücken durchdrungen. Das *Ewig* ging mir durch Mark und Bein. Eine wollüstige Thräne fiel auf das Blatt. Wie zart ist nicht die Rede des Mädchens! Es ist mir lieber als alles was Goethe je über Liebe metrisch gedichtet hat." He does not set it above the Mariane scenes in *Wilhelm Meister*. "Eine kleine Unschicklichkeit fühlte ich gleich darin, dass Alexis noch so nahe am Ufer redend eingeführt wird, und doch mit so ruhiger Sorgfalt

¹ *WSBr.*, pp. 460 and 509.

ausmalt, wie das Gleichnis vom Rätsel und das bequeme Bette. Die Mischung des Weisen und Sinnlich-Süssen mit der Leidenschaft, deren Brand halte ich dem Gedichte für wesentlich, seine eigenthümliche Schönheit. Nur gegen die Wahrheit scheint mir jenes ein kleines Verstoss. Ich erkläre es mir daraus, was Körner mir sagte, es hat erst sollen eine Heroide werden, dann ist es in diese Form umgegossen. Er hat übrigens sehr Recht es eine Idylle zu nennen. Es ist wirklich eine, nur nicht im modern Schiller'schen Sinn, sondern im Griechischen. Doch versteht sich's, dass sie mehr werth ist als alle Theokritischen und dergleichen. Wer so dichten kann, ist glücklich wie ein Gott! Gehe hin und thue desgleichen." ¹

Other poems of Goethe are favorably mentioned in the review, though much less warmly than this supreme work. *Der Chinese zu Rom* has the charm of Horace. *Die Eisbahn* is praised equally. The *tabulae votivae*, however, are not all so excellent. Some are mere versified antitheses and commonplaces, deserters from the van or rear of some philosophical discourse. These are of course from the hand of Schiller. A number of them, evidently taken to be from Goethe, are selected and praised as little masterpieces. Of those dedicated to *Einer Schlegel* makes two collections, one chaplet in the manner of Goethe's Roman elegies, whose worthiest praise is a thankful silence, the other chaplet—well, he does not wish to disturb anyone else in the enjoyment of it.

With the excuse that a critique cannot take note of everything in such a rich collection of works of genius, Schiller's product gets but slight attention. August Wilhelm's *Pygmalion* gets twice the space and more unstinted praise than all of Schiller's works together. This review appeared in October.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 284.

In August, October, and December reviews of the *Horen* continued to appear. They were in general unfavorable. The *Briefe auf einer Reise nach dem Gotthard* form a notable exception. The reviewer must have felt sure of their author in spite of their anonymity. A few pages of well-chosen excerpts, mingled with almost unqualified praise, are devoted to them. In December he writes: "jetzt scheint für die stets wechselnden und oft von ihrer Bahn abweichenden *Horen* die *Periode der Übersetzungen* gekommen zu sein." He justifies this by estimates, though he admits that the *Cellini* could not have fallen into better hands than Goethe's. This attack was ungracious, seeing that the elder brother derived good profit from some of those very translations. The *Horen*, he says further, is an example of the usual fate of undertakings brilliantly begun, but too great for the capacity of their editors. Here occurs also Schlegel's review of *Agnes von Lilien*, the supposed work of Goethe. This is the most significant and most attractive original contribution which has appeared in the *Horen* for a long time. It has, however, extravagant and squinting expressions, one poem in it is below freezing, and another is obscure. When the concluding portions appear, he greets them with an "alas!" for the lovely Agnes has now approached the mediocre and commonplace. The situations are never used with true artistic spirit and the unity is obscured by disconnected masses of petty detail, etc.

As a last blow the reviewer returns to the subject of translations, and says: "Man hat vortreffliche, mittelgute, und auch schlechte Originale aus dem Französischen, Englischen, Italienischen, Lateinischen, und dem Griechischen, vortrefflich, auch mittelmässig, und auch schlecht übersetzt."

Such treatment reached a point beyond which Schiller could endure it no longer. At first we hear but little of it. When Reichardt is coming to take Friedrich Schlegel to his

residence at Giebichenstein, Schiller calls it "*vom Teufel geholt*" and the anger against the publisher is greater than that against the contributor.¹

A little later Schiller reports Jacobi's anger at Schlegel's review of *Woldemar*, but no word escapes him to indicate personal dislike to Friedrich. On December 6, Schiller writes with satisfaction of the success of *Agnes von Lilien*, and reports the astonishing news that the Schlegels consider it a work of Goethe's genius, that Caroline's conception of Goethe had been broadened by it, that Goethe had never created a purer and more perfect feminine character. Schiller had not been able to resolve to destroy the illusion as yet.² Goethe replies in good humor: "Lassen Sie mir so lange als möglich die Ehre als Verfasser der *Agnes* zu gelten." In earlier times, he adds, a large library might have been gathered about his name.

The next utterance of Schiller concerns Schlegel's *Deutscher Orpheus*. The latter had published a defense of Kant against Schlosser, Goethe's brother-in-law. What Friedrich said was true enough in its way, but his youth, as compared with Kant and Schlosser, and the whole manner in which he wrote justified Schiller in calling his expressions "*Impertinenzen*." This essay was delayed in reaching Schiller, for it is May 16, 1797, before he reads it. He comments particularly upon the evil purpose and mere party-spirit of the essay. And then he proceeds to retail a piece of literary news in which his bitterness finds its first vent: "Es wird doch zu arg mit diesem Herrn Friedrich Schlegel." The latter had told Humboldt that he had reviewed the *Agnes* severely, but was sorry now that he had learned that it was not Goethe's work. Schiller proceeds: "Der Laffe meinte also, er müsse dafür sorgen, dass Ihr Geschmack sich nicht verschlimmre.

¹ *GSR.*, November 2, 1796.

² *Ibid.*, December 6, 1796.

Und diese Unverschämtheit kann er mit einer solchen Unwissenheit und Oberflächlichkeit paaren, dass er die *Agnes* wirklich für Ihr Werk hielt.”¹

Goethe replies next day: “Fast bei allen Urtheilen waltet nur der gute oder der böse Wille gegen die Person, und die Fratze des Parteigeistes ist mir mehr zuwider als irgend eine andre Carrikatur.”² There is no absolute express agreement with Schiller and no trace of feeling in respect to the error of the Jena critics. It is an appropriate characterization, however, of Schlegel’s whole career as reviewer. It is entirely gratuitous to see in this brief, quiet answer a rebuke of Schiller’s own tone. Goethe’s friendship for Schiller continued to deepen. Whatever his attitude toward Friedrich may have been, it was not altered much.

Two weeks after this, May 31, Schiller wrote the famous letter to August Wilhelm, which severed all literary and personal relations with the whole Schlegel family. August Wilhelm made a last effort to excuse himself from any responsibility for Friedrich’s offenses, and pleaded for a continuance of friendly relations. But the effort was based on falsehood and personal advantage on August’s part, and friendly relations with a household, of which the chief offender was a member, was too uncertain, or, rather, too certain, for Schiller’s straightforward character, and the appeal was vain. As a concession to Goethe the literary relations were partially restored, for August completely repudiated Friedrich’s reviews and Greek essay, and professed to accept the castigation of the *Xenia* as just.

This disruption brought about a triangular relationship which affects the problem in hand. Goethe’s relations to both parties put him into a peculiar attitude, one of the following possible attitudes, either (1) tolerant silence toward

¹ *Ibid.*, May 16, 1797.

² *Ibid.*, May 17, 1797.

both with possible offense to both, or (2) a choice between the two, or (3) a mediatorial attitude between the two, or (4) a double-dealing with one or both. Goethe's character is guaranty against the last. That he was expected to play the rôle of mediator with respect to August Wilhelm is clear from a letter of Goethe to Schiller of March, 1798.¹ But though a year had elapsed, Schiller's resolution remained unaltered, and the mediation failed. That Goethe should choose one party to the exclusion of the other, except for most urgent reasons, such as literary and artistic incompatibility, is contrary to his own universality of interest, even if he had had no hopes of spreading his artistic creed through the agency of these younger professed disciples, or if he had had the energy to make a firm stand against the importunity of their friendship. Goethe did the only thing compatible with his nature. He clung to both parties with a large tolerance for their personal antipathies. This does not imply indifference to one party, nor, on the other hand, does it imply equal regard for both. Goethe's friendship for Schiller overshadowed every other relationship for more than ten years. The Schlegels recognized this fact themselves, at last, and seemed to become resigned to it, though with inward vexation. Dorothea reported from Jena that Goethe visited no one but Schiller. Friedrich advised against the establishment of a *Musenalmanach* so long as Schiller had Goethe, and August Wilhelm vetoed the *Athenäumsfragmente* against Schiller, because their publication would involve the alienation of Goethe from themselves—a sacrifice too great to make for the satisfaction of revenge.

In the essays that appeared from time to time during this period almost nothing of interest to us occurs. Goethe's treatment of Nature in *Werther* is contrasted with Jacobi's

¹ *Ibid.*, March (day uncertain), 1798.

in *Woldemar*.¹ A charge of coldness, made by Herder in his *Humanitätsbriefe* is repelled by Friedrich. Coldness is a necessary *seeming* of all classic art, but Goethe is not "gefühllos" at all. He is simply perfectly plastic.² One essay appears, however, which is important to us—*Über die Homerische Poesie*. It is important because Goethe read it and expressed his opinion of it.

γ. *Die Homerische Poesie.*

Of course Homer must be a great figure in a complete history of Greek life and art, such as Schlegel planned. Accordingly, we find him early at work upon the problem. In October, 1794, he is in search of an hypothesis concerning the age of Homer. In November he inclines to the English view as against the German, but has not yet finished reading the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He finds it incredible that the two epics have come from different or various sources. He cites the opinion of the Greeks that one *αοιδός* excelled all others in genius. But this singer was an Achæan, not an Ionian as he formerly supposed. Two months later he is reading Homer, Apollodorus, and Strabo, and the English view falls of itself. About six months later these desultory investigations receive a powerful impulse through the appearance of Wolf's *Prolegomena ad Homerum*, which Friedrich considered one of the greatest books of the period, the peer of Lessing's Greek essays and Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. In fact no single book seems to have taken deeper hold upon Schlegel, excepting only *Wilhelm Meister* and Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre*.

Schlegel's essay now becomes an attempt to explain Homer from Homer himself, to picture the times in which

¹ *MS.*, Bd. II, p. 82.

² *Ibid.*, p. 47.

it was produced and outline the development of the poems into their present form. It is to be a literary analogue to Wolf's philological work. In addition it is to be essentially a treatise on epic poetry. This doctrine of the *epic* is what chiefly concerns us here.

Goethe had just finished his *Hermann und Dorothea* and was revolving in his mind a second epic, this time on a purely classic subject, the death of Achilles. Goethe and Schiller were together attempting to define and establish the differences between the drama and the epic. They wished to deduce laws for the epic and the drama, which should aid them in their own poetic production. On the whole their interest in the problem of the epic was *practical*, not *historical*. Schlegel's essay is first of all *historic* and then *theoretic*. He says :

“Die *epische Dichtart* ist unter allen die einfachste. Sie ordnet eine unbegrenzte Vielheit möglicher, äusserer, durch ursachliche Verknüpfung verbundene Gegenstände, durch Gleichartigkeit des Stoffes und Abrundung der Umrisse zu einer *bloss sinnlichen Einheit*.” The harmony of the epic is exactly opposite to that of the drama ; the former is “eine unbestimmte Masse poetischer Begebenheiten,” the latter “eine poetische Handlung.” The drama must have one principal action and one hero, the epic has many, each of which becomes in turn the center of the whole.

These ideas were derived from Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* rather than from Homer himself. This would be apparent enough on comparison with Goethe's differentiation of the drama and the *Roman*,¹ even if August Wilhelm had not directly acknowledged the debt in his review of *Hermann und Dorothea*.²

¹ *Wilhelm Meister*, Bch. v, Kap. 7, *GWke.*, Abt. I, Bd. 22, p. 178 ff.

² *AWSWke.*, Bd. IV, p. 139.

The epic is infinite, because every event is a member of an infinite series. "Jedes echt epische und harmonische Gedicht fängt in der Mitte an." "Die reine dichterische Erzählung *kennt ihrem Wesen nach weder Anfang noch Ende.*" "Gebt dem epischen Dichter Raum und Zeit, er wird nicht eher enden, als bis er seinen Stoff erschöpft, und eine vollständige Ansicht der ihn umgebenden Welt vollendet hat, wie sie die Homerische Poesie gewährt."

A poem with unity such as Goethe demanded does and must awaken certain definite expectations in respect to the movement and close of the action. But Homer, Schlegel says, "erregt keine bestimmte Erwartung *nach der Entwicklung eines Kernes, der Auflösung eines Knotens, der Vollendung einer Absicht, oder auch nach einer bestimmten Art des Stoffes*, sondern eine durchaus unbestimmte und also ins Unendliche gehende Erwartung blosser Fülle überhaupt." This may be a true characterization of Homer's epics, or it may not; but it practically denies the possibility of *any modern epic*, the very thing sought for by Goethe in all his Homeric studies.

Lest we might still suppose that this judgment was meant to apply only to Greek art, and so left hope for some modern analogue of more artistic character, Schlegel assures us that such an epic is "wirklich ein vollständiges Urbild der epischen Dichtart" because the Greeks themselves are "das Urbild des rein Menschlichen" and necessarily furnish us "den reinen Gesetzen und Begriffen der Vernunft entsprechende Anschauungen." Furthermore Homer is not only *classic* but *perfect*. A work is classic if it is the most perfect expression extant of even a crude stage of culture. To be perfect, it must be the highest art form of the most perfect stage of culture. Therefore Homer's epics are "eine vollständige Anschauung für den reinen Begriff" of epic

poetry, and contain "die Gesetze einer ursprünglichen Dichtart."

Goethe read this essay in April, 1797. On the 28th he writes to Schiller: "Haben Sie Schlegel's Abhandlung über das epische Gedicht im 11ten Stück *Deutschland* vom vorigen Jahr gesehen? Lesen Sie es ja! Es ist sonderbar, wie er, als ein guter Kopf, auf dem rechten Wege ist, *und sich ihn doch gleich wieder selbst verrennt*. Weil das epische Gedicht nicht die *dramatische Einheit* haben kann, weil man eine solche absolute Einheit in der *Ilias* und *Odyssée* nicht gerade nachweisen kann, vielmehr nach der neuern Idee *sie noch für zerstückelter angiebt als sie sind*; so soll das epische Gedicht keine Einheit *haben*, noch *fordern*, das heisst, nach meiner Vorstellung: es soll aufhören ein Gedicht zu sein. Und das sollen reine Begriffe sein, *denen doch selbst die Erfahrung, wenn man genau aufmerkt, widerspricht*. Denn die *Ilias* und *Odyssée*, und wenn sie durch die Hände von tausend Dichtern und Redakteurs gegangen wären, zeigen die gewaltige Tendenz der poetischen und kritischen Natur nach Einheit. Und am Ende ist diese neue Schlegel'sche Ausführung doch nur zu Gunsten der Wolfischen Meinung, die eines solchen Beistandes gar nicht einmal bedarf. Denn daraus, dass jene grossen Gedichte erst nach und nach entstanden sind, und zu keiner vollständigen und vollkommenen Einheit haben gebracht werden können (obgleich beide vielleicht weit vollkommener organisiert sind als man denkt) folgt noch nicht, dass ein solches Gedicht auf keine Weise vollständig, vollkommen und Eins werden könne noch solle."¹

This amounts to a complete denial of the practical and theoretical value of Friedrich's essay. Schiller himself could hardly have been severer. To Goethe the *canon* of art is not the Greeks as they were, but the Greeks as they

¹ *GSGBr.*, April 28, 1797.

would have been had they realized the perfect intention of their art. Schlegel's *canon* for all ages and times is what the Greeks *realized* in art.

Schiller seems not to have replied directly, but in a few days we find him reading, at Goethe's suggestion, Aristotle's *Poetics*, which had been discredited in Schlegel's essay. He finds the Stagyrite most excellent, "ein wahrer Hölle[n]richter für alle, die entweder an der äussern Form sklavisch hängen, oder die über alle Form sich hinwegsetzen."¹

These studies do not lead Goethe to look more favorably upon Schlegel's ideas. He writes to Schiller, May 16: "Ich bin mehr als jemals von der Einheit und Untheilbarkeit des Gedichts überzeugt, und es lebt überhaupt kein Mensch mehr, und wird nicht wieder geboren werden, der es zu beurtheilen im Stande wäre." Goethe and others are constantly forced back upon their subjective judgments. "Die Ilias erscheint mir so rund und fertig, man mag sagen was man will, dass nichts dazu und nichts davon gethan werden kann."²

Goethe now drops the subject for a time, and does not go over the ground again until after the appearance of August Wilhelm's review of *Hermann und Dorothea*. He thinks he has made some good discoveries. He embodies these in an essay, *Über epische und dramatische Dichtung*, which he appends to a letter to Schiller on December 23, 1797. Minor goes too far in assuming that Schlegel's review gave Goethe his insight into the principles which he there lays down.³ Goethe read the review, and found there that Friedrich's ideas had been modified in *one most essential point*. August Wilhelm attempts to strip the epic of all that is local to the Greek people, the Greek subject, and Homer's age, and now applies this conception of pure epic poetry to

¹ *Ibid.*, May 5, 1797.

² *Ibid.*, May 16, 1797.

³ *CuR.*, p. 216 f.

Hermann und Dorothea. This simply raises once more for Goethe the old question: What is the nature of the epic *per se*? The manner of attacking the problem shows no dependence upon the review, and the results do not show dependence upon the principles there applied. As regards the Homeric epic August Wilhelm accepts Friedrich's idea of the divisibility and infinite extensibility of it, and denies all other unity than that of the separate songs of the various rhapsodists. Goethe's essay demands first of all *Einheit* and *Entwicklung* as the basic principles of all art whatsoever.¹

As late as April 28, 1798, Goethe is still more convinced of the unity of the Homeric poems. "Indessen muss man alle Chorizonten mit dem Fluche des Bischofs Ernulphus verfluchen, und wie die Franzosen, auf Leben und Tod, die Einheit und Untheilbarkeit des poetischen Werthes in einem feinen Herzen festhalten und vertheidigen."²

But Goethe had received and read another of Friedrich's works before he came upon the above earlier essay in *Deutschland*. This was the fragmentary volume *Die Griechen und Römer* with its introductory essay, *Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie*. It appeared early in 1797, though it had been sent to press as early as December, 1795. We shall constantly refer to this essay as the *Studium* for sake of brevity.

δ. *Studium der Griechischen Poesie*.

The briefest analysis of this essay must suffice. It begins with an almost complete denial of the æsthetic worth of all modern poetry. There are individuals who stand out like rocks jutting from the fog in a distant landscape. Such are Dante, Shakespeare, and *Goethe*. Even these were moralists

¹ V. whole review. *AWSWke.*, Bd. II, pp. 183 ff.

² *GSR.*, April 28, 1798.

rather than poets. They were more interested in laying upon the altar of humanity the best which they knew and thought and strove for, than in producing perfect art-works from the standpoint of the *Beautiful*, which is here Schlegel's æsthetic watchword.

There is no settled public taste, no settled public morals out of which an æsthetic tradition might grow. Even the great æsthetic thinkers have had no influence upon the formation of taste. *Theory*, drawn from the current poetic practice, lost all credit with the public, and chance became the unlimited despot of a realm of confusion. Each successful favorite is hounded to disfavor or oblivion by a host of pitiful imitators. Germany is especially unfortunate because of this plague of imitators. Her poetry represents "ein beinahe vollständiges geographisches Naturalienkabinett aller Nationalcharaktere jedes Zeitalters und jeder Weltgegend." In the midst of all this disharmony the æsthetic faculty, like Faust, "taumelt von Begierde zu Genuss, und im Genuss verschmachtet nach Begierde," and in unsatisfied longing and vain striving is driven almost to despair.

This chaos must be explainable in some manner. Schlegel naturally chooses the historic method of clarification. To explain how it became is to hint at what it must become. To note its past course of development is to prophesy its future course. To discern its present movement is to foretell its future goal.

Perhaps the universal despair itself will give birth to a great confidence for the future. Anarchy is the mother of beneficent revolutions. There are signs of a catastrophe which may inaugurate a better era. What these signs are will appear later.

After all, we are assured that there is no such thing as absolute "Charakterlosigkeit." Modern life is in fact a vast unity, heterogeneity being merely one of its most striking

elements. Mutual imitation among modern nations, their common imitation of antiquity from lack of originality, the coexistence of a higher and a lower type of art in all these nations, these are elements of unity. The preponderance of the *characteristic*, and the insatiable striving after the new and *piquant*, are still other elements. Therefore there must be some *inner unity* of modern art.

Schlegel tries to show by the very nature of culture that modern life and art had to become what it did. All life is activity, and all activity brings culture. But life is a contest between the individual and environment. "Nur das Gemüth, welches von dem Schicksal hinlänglich durchgearbeitet worden ist (sc. Goethe?) erreicht das seltene Glück selbständig sein zu können." In all other cases either the individual will (Freiheit) or environment (Natur) must give the determining impulse to action. In one case the result is *artificial* culture, in the other *natural*. Experience shows that the natural precedes the artificial in all nations. The natural is harmonious and lasts until *instinct* disturbs it. The earliest stages of European culture already show traces of artificiality. These increase with time. Rhyme, which Schlegel disliked and declared unjustifiable, which only a great artist like Goethe could render harmless, as in *Faust*, was a common element of mediæval art.

The *Christian religion*, with its insistence upon the relative worthlessness of the flesh and the world, compared with spirit and eternal life, was the germ of all this artificial culture, and the essential cause of the unity among modern nations.

The progress of this religion brought about corruption and confusion in which only one guide remained, the authority of the ancients. The critical faculty was not developed sufficiently to formulate independent law out of itself, and hence was forced to rely upon imitation of *fixed*

models. This led to complete individualism in art as opposed to earlier *schools* of art.

The *reason*, in its first efforts to overcome the errors of false imitation, actually adds to the confusion by commingling the various arts, as music and poetry, or the various kinds of a single art, as the drama and the lyric, the drama and the epic, the epic and the lyric, etc. Here Schlegel stands squarely upon the platform of Weimar classicism.

Out of didactic poetry, so characteristic of the moderns, grows, through the activity of the *Vernunft*, true philosophic poetry as contrasted with beauty poetry,—to the *philosophic* tragedy of Shakespeare with its “highest disharmony” as opposed to the *beauty* tragedy of Goethe and Sophocles with its “highest harmony.”

In an excursion on *Hamlet*, the philosophic tragedy, Schlegel praises in high terms Goethe’s analysis in *Wilhelm Meister*, but repeats his previous restrictions in the terms, “nur vergesse man nicht was er (*Hamlet*) war.”

The one hopeful element in all modern art is the constant striving for an *æsthetic maximum*. This can be found only in the *universal*, the *permanent*, the *necessary*, *i. e.*, in Friedrich’s terminology, the *objective*. This argues that the *interesting* must be only a crisis, a transition stage in the development of modern art.

Schlegel admits that there may be retrogression through all degrees of badness to the complete extinction of taste, but insists that under *proper conditions* progress will be made to the *objective*. These conditions are great moral force and firm independence.

But the *objective*, being fixed, is a never attainable goal of art, the continued approach to which must rest upon devoted efforts of all true lovers of poetry. In these efforts wise leadership alone is needed. The imitation of all *nationalities* must be turned into a preparation for German *univer-*

salutary, and the evil will be destroyed. Indeed the crisis is already passing favorably. "Der Charakter der aesthetischen Bildung unsres Zeitalters und unsrer Nation verräth sich selbst durch ein merkwürdiges und grosses Symptom. Goethens Poesie ist die Morgenröthe echter Kunst und reiner Schönheit, etc." Goethe's poetry, characterized throughout several pages of extravagant eulogium, is the demonstration that the *objective* is attainable, at least approximately.

To confirm this happy revolution several prejudgments must be set aside. Poetry must not be considered the peculiar gift of early or crude peoples, nor the necessary victim of civilization and scientific progress. Its organ, the imagination, is a permanent element of the soul and cannot be destroyed by true culture. The golden age lies ahead and not behind. Schlegel finds it truly wonderful how a belief in the beautiful is awakening again, how the need of the *objective* is being felt everywhere. The moment is ripe for an aesthetic revolution. If we try to conceive this revolution as Friedrich conceived it, we find first Schlegel's proclamation of Goethe's poetry as *objective* art, and second the proclamation of his own and August Wilhelm's critical judgments as *objective* criticism. When these two are accepted as the law and its fulfilment, the aesthetic heteronomy of Germany will be ended.

Objective criticism implies a *true theory* of art. This is difficult in itself, yet is of itself insufficient. The true theory needs an *Anschauung*, which is a universal natural history of art. This necessary *Anschauung* is furnished by Greek art as a whole.

One naturally expects to find following this a careful consideration of the spirit, the principles of Greek art, and perhaps a fine characterization of the masterpieces which make up this proposed "gesetzgebende Anschauung," but

confusion holds carnival in the remainder of the essay, which logically is already finished, excepting the expected outlines of Greek art. Homer and Sophocles are eulogized later on in the essay, but no serious effort is made to characterize in brief the whole Greek spirit, though this rather than the practice of individual authors is the canon of art.

A few ideas here and there are worthy of note in this connection. As a condition of objectivity Friedrich demands "Versinnlichung des Allgemeinen" and "Nachahmung des Einzelnen"—a demand which belongs primarily to Goethe's artistic creed. Objectivity itself is merely "das gesetzmässige Verhältniss" between these two principles. No special degree of perfection is required in either term of the ratio, but the ratio itself is fixed by absolute law. Objectivity thus turns out to be a useless and pernicious abstraction, for Schlegel can now commend every work of Greek art from the prehomeric crudities down to the last product of the corrupt Alexandrian school as a model on the mere ground of objectivity.

Here a characterization of Goethe's style as a mixture of the styles of Homer, Euripides, and Aristophanes is introduced with no very apparent excuse.

Certain objections to this Greek program for modern art are now taken up. The Greeks are defended against charges of immorality on the ground that decency has no right to dictate in matters of poetry. To the objection that imitation has been tried, he replies that it has never been tried *rightly*. The poet must know the whole mass of Greek literature before he can truly imitate its spirit. "Nur der ahmt sie *wirklich* nach, der sich die Objectivität der ganzen Masse, den schönen Geist der einzelnen Dichter, und den vollkommenen Styl des goldenen Zeitalters zueignet." The Olympian of Weimar must have smiled when he noted this passage, with its boundless demand of erudition on his part, before he could reach his goal.

Another error in previous efforts at imitation is the failure to separate the *local* from the *objective* or *universal* in Greek art. This is difficult, *but must be done*. Local forms are the *didactic*, which has no justification except in the age of myth, and the *epic*, which has no justification except in the age just preceding the rise of the drama and of authentic history. While these observations are doubtless true in a proper sense, we must note again in passing how fundamentally different this view is from Goethe's, according to which a modern epic is justified if it fulfils the conditions of a perfected Greek epic.

We are told that all modern imitations of Homer have failed (Goethe's *Hermann* has not yet appeared), from Tasso to Wieland.

The *mythic* element is *local* and impossible in a modern drama, because the myth itself must needs be explained first to the beholders. One might even doubt the possibility of a "beauty drama" in modern times, were it not for the existence of an almost perfect one—*Don Carlos*.

This is a decided note of dishonesty. The praise of Schiller's play as objective, as a beauty drama in a Greek sense, was either bitter irony in the midst of an otherwise wholly serious essay, or it was an effort to conciliate Schiller by an awkward and transparent sham.

Goethe is now criticised for his improper treatment of Homer in earlier years. This was a tendency to modernize him: "Wer den Homer nur interessant findet, der entweiht ihn. . . . Der ursprüngliche Zauber der Heldenzeit wird in dem Gemüthe, welches mit den Zerrüttungen der Misbildung bekannt ist, ohne doch den Sinn für Natur ganz verloren zu haben, unendlich erhöht; und ein unzufriedener Bürger unsres Jahrhunderts kann leicht in der Griechischen Ansicht jener reizenden Einfalt, Freiheit und Innigkeit alles zu finden glauben, was er entbehren muss. Eine solche

Werther'sche Ansicht des ehrwürdigen Dichters ist kein reiner Genuss des Schönen, keine reine Würdigung der Kunst."

To imitate the Greeks truly, one must bring to their study an objective philosophy of history, and an objective philosophy of art. This is practically a demand for the dictatorship of an erudite critic, such as Schlegel felt himself to be. He demands specifically that the dictatorship of Aristotle, even as reinterpreted by Lessing, shall end.

The three great periods of modern literature are now reviewed in order. The third and last, the immediate future, is to see the conquest of *objective* theory, *objective* taste, *objective* creative art, as well as *objective* imitation. Kant and Fichte are establishing the first, August Wilhelm Schlegel is wielding the sceptre of objective taste, Goethe is creating objective poetry, and Friedrich Schlegel is hereby announcing an objective history of Greek art which shall be the firm basis of all the preceding objectivities.

In this revolution Germany is to lead. All other nations must first learn of Germany an *objective theory* before they can share in the movement. "Welchen weiten Weg haben unsre einzigen bedeutenden Nebenbuhler, die Franzosen, noch zurückzulegen, ehe sie es nur ahnen können, wie sehr sich Goethe den Griechen näherte."

If now we take a view of this essay as a whole we see that Schlegel is not deeply interested in the Greeks *per se*, as was Winckelmann. His primary interest is in contemporary art. In fact this interest is overwhelming. For him there is no doubt that Germany is to be the intellectual leader of Europe and the world in all fields. In German intellectual life the highest and best thing is *art*, *poetic art*. "Die einzige, eigentliche reine Kunst ohne erborgte Kraft und fremde Hülfe ist Poesie."¹ In poetic art only one

¹ *MS.*, Bd. I, p. 37. Cf. Lyceums fragment No. 7. *Ibid.*, Bd. II, p. 184.

name stands out as worthy of highest praise, that of Goethe.

If we wish to realize what were Schlegel's purposes in his Hellenic studies, we have to consider such facts as these. Friedrich knew the conditions of German literature. He knew that Goethe's and Schiller's art looked to Greece for its inspiration and stood in open conflict with the rationalism and Philistinism of Nikolai, *et al.* Goethe's practise in recent times was so exclusively Greek and his utterances on Greek art in the Roman elegies, etc., so extremely favorable that Schlegel must have known his general position, even if we leave out of account all other sources of information, as correspondence, rumor, and the news retailed in public prints. One might easily discern a greater partiality for the Greeks on Goethe's part than on Schiller's. Schlegel chose to lead a literary life. He had no originality and force to create a new movement, and he realized it. He had to ally himself with parties already existing. Weimar classicism represented that revolt against Philistinism with which his whole nature sympathized. He elected to become an auxiliary of this movement. His most hopeful, indeed only opportunity lay in criticism. The imperfect knowledge of Greek literature then current gave him a fruitful suggestion and he made vast plans to contribute a broader and more critical basis to Goethe's Hellenizing effort in behalf of German art. This essay is merely programmatic, setting forth his aims and methods as an aesthetic lawgiver.

At the earliest moment a volume is sent to Goethe for his judgment. On March 13, 1797, Goethe records in his journal : "Nachmittag, Schlegel's *Griechen und Römer* ;" again, March 15, "Mittag, zu Schiller, nachher an Klopstock und Schlegel weiter gelesen ;" March 19, "dazu Schlegel ;" March 20, "Nach Tische, Schlegel's *Griechen und Römer*." ¹ These

¹ *G Wke.*, Abt. III, Bd. 2, pp. 63 ff. *Tagebuch*.

are the only direct testimonies of Goethe with respect to the *Studium*. He does not mention it in letters to Schiller nor in his other correspondence. We can only infer his opinions and attitude.

That Goethe must have been interested in the theme needs no mention, for he was at the height of his classicism. He recognized in the midst of its confusion an essential kinship with Schiller's æsthetic doctrines.¹ He had been himself an enthusiast on the exclusive canonicity of the Greeks before Schiller's æsthetic doctrine was fully formulated.²

Furthermore Goethe found here in most emphatic form his own conception of art as an organism. Much more pronounced than in the *Schulen* is the idea of the naturalness and organic unity and growth of all Greek life, with its expression in an equally organic literature. "Aber jenes höchste Schöne ist ein gewordnes *organisch gebildetes Ganzes*, welches durch die kleinste Trennung zerrissen, durch das geringste Übergewicht zerstört wird." "Die Einheit seiner Dramen ist nicht mechanisch erzwungen, sondern *organisch entstanden*." "Ihre Zusammensetzung ist durchaus gleichartig, rein und einfach wie der *Organismus der plastischen Natur*, nicht wie der Mechanismus des technischen Verstandes." "In ihr ist der ganze Kreislauf der *organischen Entwicklung* der Kunst abgeschlossen und vollendet." Many other passages occur. One has a close resemblance to *Faust*, "Wenn der kritische Anatom die schöne Organisation eines Kunstwerkes erst zerstört, in elementarische Masse analysiert, und mit dieser dann mancherlei physische Versuche anstellt, aus denen er stolze Resultate zieht; so täuscht er sich selbst auf eine sehr handgreifliche Weise: denn das Kunstwerk existiert gar nicht mehr."³

¹ *GGE*, March 21, 1830.

² *Einwirkung der neuern Philosophie*, Goethe's *Nachlass*, Bd. 10, p. 53.

³ Cf. *Faust* fragment of 1790, ll. 415-18.

If Dilthey be correct we have here a Goethean contribution to Schlegel's thought.¹ Haym seems to accept the view that this idea of organization, organic development, and unity of art comes originally from Goethe.² If so, it may have been mediated to Schlegel through Herder's *Ideen* which he read as early as 1791. The idea did not become prominent in his essays until after the reading and rereading of *Wilhelm Meister* in the early months of 1795, while the *Studium* was in progress. The *Meister* seemed to him a complete treatise on art, and its utterances on *Hamlet* and its development, as well as other passages on other phases of art, may well have stimulated the development of the idea of organization in art to the prominence which it finally attained. Pichtos refers this conception of art to Goethe and Kant, both of whom Schlegel studied carefully.³ Special investigation would be necessary to determine the source and course of development of this æsthetic doctrine, even if it should not prove finally to be one of those conceptions which are in the air, whose origin is not ascribable to any one leading thinker in particular. In any case this attitude toward Greek art was a commendable feature in the eyes of Goethe.

Another recommendation, according to Schüddekopf, Hehn, and others, was the unstinted praise of Goethe's poetry, which must have proved refreshing in the midst of almost universal apathy, or hostility or misunderstanding. Haym remarks that Goethe's tolerance of the Schlegels "sich reichlich bezahlt machte." On the strength of these undoubted facts we are assured that Goethe must have been either more or less than human, not to have welcomed this

¹ *DLS.*, p. 170-6.

² *HLH.*, Bd. II, pp. 203, 208, 222, 233, etc. The whole discussion of Herder's dependence upon Goethe is in point.

³ *PAesth.*, pp. 18 and 28.

praise as a sign of his spreading influence. Possibly, but we must hardly assume that Goethe's character was petty enough to be greatly moved by extravagant praise. It is probable that he felt at this time, as later, that the Schlegels were offering him adulation that was not due, "das mir nicht zukam," as he says. He excused it all to Wieland as beyond his control: "Man muss sich das ebenso gefallen lassen, als wenn man aus vollem Halse getadelt wird."¹

It is certain from Goethe's letters that he had no hopes of influencing the older generation, and that he looked to the representatives of the younger, the Humboldts, the Schlegels, etc., for recognition and propaganda of his ideas and principles. In such cases he could overlook minor differences and hope for growing harmony unless the differences tended to become greater. As disciples Goethe tolerated the Schlegels, and not as incense offerers.

The faults of obscurity and the utter lack of organization of the *Studium* must have repelled Goethe as they did Schiller. A man "dem die Natur ein offenes Auge verliehen hatte, alles was ihn umgiebt, rein und klar und gleichsam mit dem Blick des Naturforschers aufzunehmen, der in allen Gegenständen des Nachdenkens und der Empfindung nur *Wahrheit* und *gediegenen Gehalt* schätzt, und vor dem kein Kunstwerk, dem nicht *verständige und regelmässige Anordnung*, kein *Raisonnement*, dem nicht *geprüfte Beobachtung*, keine Handlung besteht, der nicht *consequente Maximen* zu Grunde liegen,"² must have been wonderfully tolerant to remain silent.

Goethe's silence is rather to be interpreted as meaning that he considered the castigation of the unripeness, the paradoxes and follies of this essay in Schiller's *Xenia* an appropriate and final comment.

¹ *BGG.*, Bd. I, pp. 280 f.

² *HWke.*, Bd. 4, pp. 143 ff. *Über Hermann und Dorothea.*

A certain exchange of ideas with Schiller shortly after this time has reference to the contents of the *Studium*. The latter writes under date of July 7, 1797: "Es wäre, dünkt mir, jetzt gerade der rechte Moment, dass die Griechischen Kunstwerke *von Seiten des Charakteristischen* beleuchtet und durchgegangen würden; denn allgemein herrscht noch immer der Winckelmann'sche und Lessing'sche Begriff, und *unsre allerneuesten Aesthetiker*, so wohl über Poesie als Plastik, *lassen sich's nicht sauer werden*, das Schöne der Griechen *von allem Charakteristischen* zu befreien, und *dieses* zum Merkzeichen des Modernen zu machen. Mir dünkt dass die neuen Analytiker durch ihre Bemühungen, den Begriff des Schönen abzusondern und in einer gewissen Reinheit aufzustellen, ihn beinahe ausgehöhlt und in einen leeren Schall verwandelt haben, dass man in der Entgegensetzung *des Schönen* gegen das *Richtige* und *Treffende* viel zu weit gegangen ist, und eine Absonderung, die bloss der Philosoph macht, und die bloss von einer Seite statthaft ist, viel zu grob genommen hat."¹

In reply Goethe secures for the *Horen* an essay by Hirt on the *Laokoon*, in which the characteristic in Greek art is emphatically shown. This essay was not exactly what either Goethe or Schiller wanted, but it had the merit of calling attention to the presence of the characteristic even in the best Greek sculptures. Goethe's part in this matter is clearly stated in his letter to Kunst-Meyer of July 14, 1797 (*q. v.*). It was a misunderstanding of the beautiful to make it exclude the characteristic. To set Weimar classicism in a correct light with respect both to Hirt's essay and to Schlegel's *Studium*, Goethe wrote his *Laokoon*, which likewise brings the characteristic in Greek sculpture to a much greater prominence than does Lessing's work. Goethe planned a whole series of such essays for the same purpose.

¹ *GStBr.*, July 7, 1797.

Hirt's essay was felt by the Schlegels to be a direct attack upon the position of Friedrich in the *Studium*. This is shown by the long critical notice of it in the *Litterarischer Reichsanzeiger* of the *Athenäum*, vol. II, No. 2, and by *Fragment*, No. 310. We cannot say then with Minor¹ that Goethe allied himself with the Schlegels against Hirt in favor of Winckelmann's idea of beauty. His *Laokoon* is a polemic against both, and distinctly agrees with Schiller that the new æsthetic critics had *misunderstood* the idea of beauty when they made it exclude the characteristic.

ε. *Lyceumsfragmente*.

About this time there appeared in Unger's *Lyceum der Schönen Künste* a series of one hundred and twenty-seven *Kritische Fragmente*. We have seen that Schlegel's interests were modern and German from the start, that under special influences he turned to the study of the Greeks to find a critical basis for a sound judgment of modern literature, and a mode of imitation which might perfect modern German literary creations. We have seen that for a time this secondary movement seemed to absorb all his energies, but it was merely seeming. The original nature of Friedrich Schlegel was so insistent that it burst through all this constraint and found expression in its most appropriate form—practical formlessness—in fragments.

The essential thing discussed in the Lyceum fragments is the *Roman*. The *Roman* is the Socratic dialogue of modern times (26),² a compendium or encyclopædia of the spiritual life of a man of genius (78). All the novels of any single author are in one sense only *a single Roman*, and it is

¹ *CuR.*, p. 217.

² Numbers refer to those of the fragments in *MS*. Bd. II, pp. 183 ff.

superfluous to write more than one, unless the author has become a new man (89).

Though they name neither Goethe nor any of his works, these fragments were written during the time in which Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* seemed the greatest product of all recent literature, and are so many fragmentary characterizations of it. However, we are not left without direct evidence that these are chips from the workshop of a man who is carving out æsthetic doctrines from the materials of Goethe's novel.

In No. 124, Friedrich defines rhyme as "symmetrische Wiederkehr des Gleichen," and names as an example the scene in *Wilhelm Meister* where the old Barbara sets the bottle of champagne and three glasses on the table before Wilhelm.

In No. 120 occurs the famous dictum: "Wer Goethens *Meister* gehörig charakterisierte, der hätte damit wohl eigentlich gesagt, was es jetzt an der Zeit ist in der Poesie. Er dürfte sich, was poetische Kritik betrifft, immer zur Ruhe setzen."

No. 20, with its statement that a classic product must never be fully intelligible, refers specifically to *Wilhelm Meister*. Other fragments refer to Goethe's other works, or to himself as an artist. One defends him against charges of metrical carelessness (6). Another refers to him as a "Kunstwerk der Natur" (1). Nothing is more *piquant* than a genius who has mannerisms, that is, provided they do not possess him—which is often affirmed of Goethe (88). "Welches ist denn nun die poetische Poesie?" he asks in No. 120, and certainly implies the answer, "Goethe's."

Of all modern poets Goethe alone is mentioned with favor in the whole collection. Bodmer is jested at. Lessing is mentioned twice. The rest are passed over in silence.

But Friedrich's position in Jena had by this time become *impossible*. Berlin, with its small "Goethe-gemeinde" in

the midst of overwhelming rationalism, seemed the most favorable spot for his further activities. He would beard the lion in his den, attack the "Aufklärungs-Berlinismus" and its representative, Nikolai, in its own stronghold. Before leaving Jena, he had the great honor of meeting Goethe. We find in Goethe's journal under date of June 10, "Mit Friedrich Schlegel spazieren." But the two did not enter into relations approaching in degree of familiarity even the rather exoteric friendliness which existed in 1800.

3. *Berlin.*

a. Athenäum, Vol. I.

All in all the first Jena period was one of personal failure and of no adequate literary success on Friedrich's part. His choice of Reichardt as publisher would not have recommended him in Weimar and Jena, if he had published nothing but Greek studies. That he became his publisher's ready tool in attacking the classic poets, and published those ill-advised reviews of the *Musen Almanache* and the *Horen*, led to a complete rupture with Schiller, which closed the columns of the *Horen* to August Wilhelm and made open friendly relations with Goethe impossible. Goethe and Schiller soon had the satisfaction of seeing Friedrich at odds with Reichardt—a fulfilment of their prophecy.

As a result, our literary and critical dictators were placed in a difficult situation both financially and in respect to a medium for their ideas. Friedrich was especially hurt by the loss of a publisher. August Wilhelm had still the *Jen. Lit. Zeitung* for his short critical reviews, but there existed no medium so profitable or so exclusive and select as the *Horen* to which he might turn for his more pretentious literary efforts. Under these circumstances it is not strange that

they thought seriously of founding a new journal. Since Friedrich's situation was the more galling, it was but natural that he should be the leading spirit in urging on the enterprise, determining its character, and, in fact, editing it after it was founded.

The first of August, 1797, finds Friedrich Schlegel in Berlin. He is soon introduced into the best literary society. He meets Schleiermacher, who is also an exponent of radicalism and reform in the spirit of Berlin enlightenment. Through this friend Schlegel gets an introduction into the salon of Henriette Herz and is thus brought into contact with the celebrities of the day. Friedrich's personal appearance had something imposing in it, and his erudition and wit, and his reputation as a eulogist of Goethe soon made him the acknowledged leader and spokesman of the "Goethe-gemeinde" in Berlin. This social round and dining-out was unfavorable to literary production. Financial pressure made it impossible to continue his Greek works to completion. Besides he had now a decided distaste for them. Therefore he rounded them off perfunctorily and published them as fragments, in order to devote himself to the new journal.

After almost interminable discussion, the nature of the journal, its size and frequency of issue, the rate of payment, the mutual power of veto, the advisability of admitting other contributors, etc., etc., are determined, and whether it shall see the light as an accomplished fact, depends largely upon Friedrich's capacity to produce sufficient literary material himself or to stimulate August Wilhelm to its production. This new *Hercules* of the literary world, a mere *Schlegeleum* in substance, is to appear before the public with the presumptuous title of *Athenäum*.¹

¹ All these names were proposed and considered before finally adopting the last.

The literary position of the *Athenäum* for the time being is clearly shown by the materials which are to fill the first two numbers. There is to be a *Characterization of Wilhelm Meister*; a mass of *Fragments* full of Goethe and *Universal-poesie*; an essay on Goethe's lyric poetry and *Reineke Fuchs*;¹ Novalis' *Blütenstaub* is to appear with its proclamation of Goethe as "der wahre Stadthalter des poetischen Geistes auf Erden;" August Wilhelm is to proclaim Goethe's *prose style* and his "goldenes Märchen" or "Märchen *par excellence*," also Goethe's mediatorial function in German studies of Shakespeare. It is plain that the *Athenäum* was intended to establish a literary school on the basis of Goethe's poetry.

This relation to Goethe is further shown by various passages in the letters of Friedrich to August Wilhelm. The latter fears that Goethe may take offense at certain fragments, but Friedrich replies that Goethe's feelings cannot be considered if they are to remain true to their fundamental principle. They might be silent, but unfortunately the offending fragment is already printed.² August Wilhelm's marginal notes to the collection of Friedrich's fragments are significant. "Goethe wird lächeln," "Goethe wird die Stirn runzeln," etc. But Friedrich will not strike out a fragment from such motives.³

Minor calls attention to the prominent influence which Goethe's *Propyläen* had upon the form and substance of the *Athenäum*, and especially points out Goethe's fondness for the form of correspondence, conversation, etc., and the *Kunstnovelle*, as the inspiration to similar forms in the *Athenäum*.⁴ We need only add that these influences scarcely affect the first two numbers.

¹ *WSBr.*, p. 353.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 361 f., also p. 372. Cf. Preface to *Ath.*, vol. 1.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 373.

⁴ *CuR.*, p. 218.

a. *Fragmente.*

If we except the prose comments on his brother's translations of fragments of Greek elegies, the *Fragmente* are Friedrich's first contribution. Their anonymity, their joint authorship, the intention of the brothers to assume the responsibility jointly (since they enjoyed the right of mutual veto), their effort to establish a school by polemic against *Aufklärung*, all point to direct kinship with the *Xenia*. If Friedrich had had poetic talent, there is little doubt that these fragments would have become a collection of elegiac distichs. We shall accept as Friedrich's contributions those fragments not credited to any other contributor by Minor.¹

Goethe is not directly mentioned in many places. In one fragment his world-historic position is fixed: "die Französische Revolution, Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre*, und Goethes *Meister* sind die grössten Tendenzen des Zeitalters" (216).² In another Goethe is ranked with Dante and Shakespeare, and all three are "der grosse Dreiklang der modernen Poesie." Goethe's poetry is "reine poetische Poesie" and "die vollständigste Poesie der Poesie" (247). In No. 228 *Transcendentalpoesie* is defined in terms that are plainly derived from Schiller. It begins as *satire* with the absolute difference of the ideal and the real, hovers as *elegy* in the middle, and ends as the *idyl* with the absolute identity of both the ideal and the real.³ But to this it must add a constant self-characterization, "eine schöne Selbstbespiegelung," as in *Wilhelm Meister* particularly. Goethe alone

¹ In *MS.* those fragments known to be from other authors than Friedrich are printed in smaller type.

² Numerals refer to numbers in *MS.* Bd. II, pp. 203 ff.

³ Cf. Schiller's *Naïve und Sentimentalische Dichtung*, paragraphs on the Satire, the Elegy, and the Idyl.

among moderns produces this *Transcendentalpoesie*. Goethe's ballads, especially the *Braut von Korinth*, are made the text of a long fragment on the poetic *Märchen*, which must be infinitely bizarre, yet bewitch the mind and charm the soul (429).

These are all the direct utterances, unless No. 193 is the joint product of the brothers.

But before we discuss the æsthetic doctrines contained in the rest of these fragments, we must consider Friedrich's essay on *Wilhelm Meister*, which, as we saw, was to be in itself a sort of æsthetic compendium.

b. Wilhelm Meister.

Friedrich follows the development of the first and second books with a deep interest in the scenes and characters, but he keeps a keen eye for the poet's mysterious purposes, of which there are many more than we commonly think.

The whole work is *organic*. Not a pause is accidental or insignificant, he says. Everything is means and goal. Thus the first part can be considered as a unit in itself. Its subject-matter is *art*. It is "poetische Physik der Poesie," and was originally intended to be a didactic poem on art. The drama is selected as its central theme, because it alone of all the arts is social and many-sided enough to form the basis of a *Roman*. Nevertheless, it is not merely an historical philosophy of art, but in itself "reine hohe Poesie." Its author is at the same time a divine poet and perfect artist, and every slight feature of even secondary parts seems to enjoy an independent objective existence even to the extent of contradicting the laws of probability. And such wonderful prose! And everywhere golden fruits are offered in silver vessels.

One must not assume that the poet is not in earnest because he scarcely ever mentions his hero without irony

and because he seems to smile down upon his own masterpiece from the serene heights of his spirit. In fact one must not judge by ordinary standards "*dieses schlechthin neue und einzige Buch, welches man nur aus sich selbst verstehen lernen kann.*" It cannot even be reviewed like an ordinary book. It must be read and *felt*.

It disappoints the ordinary expectations of unity as often as it fulfills them, but it has a living personality for him who has "Sinn für das Universum." The deeper his investigations, the more spiritual unity it has.

However, the beginning and the end are not completely in harmony, however deeply studied. Credit what one may to the justifiable effect of "das Göttliche der gebildeten Willkür" there still remains something isolated in the *Roman*. "Es fehlt eben die letzte Verknüpfung der Gedanken und der Gefühle."

This is no serious fault. Like the *Iliad*, *Wilhelm Meister* is a great whole made up of lesser wholes whose unity is greater than that of the entire work. It is a mistake to demand unity in the whole and to lose one's self in the infinitely little in studying the faulty articulation of the parts. Each book opens a new scene and a new world, elaborates the materials of the preceding and contains the germs of the succeeding.

In the third book everything is comic. "Die Ironie schwebt über dem ganzen Werke." Schlegel mentions also "ein sich selbst belächelnder Schein von Würde und Bedeutsamkeit." Other instances of irony are Jarno's want of imagination and Aurelia's lack of judgment and sense of the appropriate. These "Verstandesmenschen" are shown in their limitations to indicate that the whole book is not a mere eulogy on the "Verstand," as it might seem at first.

The *Hamlet* criticism represents an essential step in Wilhelm's artistic development. The striking adaptability of

the characters to assume the various rôles of *Hamlet* is emphasized, but the whole fifth book sinks below the level of the whole *Roman*, with the exception of *Mignon* in the rôle of *Mænad*.

Even the "*Bekenntnisse einer schönen Seele*," in spite of the unexampled arbitrariness of Goethe in inserting them as a chapter, are justified by Schlegel. They are the history of an actress who decks out her *Gemüt* and plays all parts before the mirror of conscience. They form a picture of the inner life contrasted with the outer life of other portions, and are therefore necessary to the universality of the work. They represent religion becoming an art, and so accord with the spirit of the whole. Besides, the "schöne Seele" herself belongs to the ancestral stock of the family with which Wilhelm is to be allied.

This whole chapter so resembles a portrait that Schlegel wishes to rescue it from the charge of unideality, by asserting that all characters of the *Roman* are similarly drawn, all being objective and realistic, but that at the same time all are fundamentally *allegoric* and *universal*.

In the fourth volume, he says, the *Roman* comes of age. It passes from a mere treatise on the theatre into the great drama of humanity itself, from a mere treatise on art into the art of all arts, "*die Kunst zu leben*," and gives us the solid results of a philosophy founded upon a noble spirit and a striving for the sublime universality of human forces and arts. Wilhelm's apprenticeship is now over, he resigns his will, and "*Natalie wird Supplement des Romans*."

The women, Natalie and Theresa, are examples from which a perfect theory of womanhood might be derived, namely by combining the two into one personality, and then characterizing her.

Schlegel excuses as a poetic license on a grand scale the employment of the secret society as an agency in Wilhelm's development.

The principal characters are now treated. The uncle and the *abbé* are the two mighty pillars upon which rests the heaven-piercing cupola, Lothario, the one perfect character. These three architectonic natures embrace and sustain the whole edifice. The other characters are mere images and decorations of the temple. They interest the intellect, but for the *Gemüt* they are mere allegorical puppets. Not so, however, Mignon, Sperata, and Augustino, "die heilige Familie der Naturpoesie, welche dem Ganzen romantischen Zauber und Musik geben, und im Übermass ihrer eigenen Seelengluth zu Grunde gehen."

Thus in brief what Schlegel saw in *Wilhelm Meister* at this time. Only in his characterizations of Goethe and Sophocles in the *Studium* and in his review of *Alexis und Dora* does he approach this fine enthusiasm, this high tone of unmixed eulogy, this warmth and partisanship which justifies even grave artistic faults and weaknesses. Everything appears here "göttlich, gelassen und rein."

I. *Theories of Romantic Art, etc.*

We now turn to the romantic doctrines as propounded in more or less chaotic fashion in the *Fragments of the Athenäum*. Haym has worked out this problem with considerable fulness and essential correctness.¹

A fundamental change of attitude has been produced by the constant reading of *Wilhelm Meister*. Just as Friedrich went from Goethe's *Iphigenie* to the study of the Greeks, so now he is brought face to face with a new problem of art in Goethe's *Roman*. All Hellenistic ideas of purity of form are contradicted by this book. It is a new creation of genius. It could not occur to our critic to condemn the new work

¹ *HRS.*, *Drittes Kapitel*, pp. 235 ff.

because of its transgression of old rules. Goethe's genius was above rules. Hence this book was a new *fact* in art, a new species of literature, and its rules must be deduced from a study of itself (*v. supra*). In No. 252 the position of the *Roman* is made to correspond with Schiller's ideal of the final perfected sentimental poetry, or with Schlegel's own conception of the union of the essentially antique with the essentially modern. The *Roman* represents the final harmony of *Kunst* and *Natur*.

The absorbing study of *Wilhelm Meister* led soon to the identification of the *Roman* with poetry *per se*. This was but a step. Assuming once that the *Roman* represents the final triumph of modern art in its progress toward objectivity, classicism, nature, this type of art must be greater than the classics, greater than the modern masterpieces. It must be all-inclusive, and supersede all lesser, partial forms of art, however justifiable at stages preceding the *Roman* era. Hence a proper characterization of the *Roman*, especially of *Wilhelm Meister*, the great original of the class, must result in a complete doctrine of poetry itself.¹ Many of the *Athenäum* fragments are simply parts of this necessary characterization. Compare Nos. 111, 116, 118, 139, 146, 216, 238, 252, 255, 297, 434, and 451.

No. 116 is the classic programmatic fragment for the æsthetic doctrines of Friedrich Schlegel. "Die romantische Poesie ist eine progressive Universalpoesie." "Romantische Poesie" is simply *Roman* poetry.² If the *Roman* is once identified with the final harmony of *Kunstpoesie* and *Naturpoesie* it becomes an absolutely unattainable ideal goal. All art must constantly approach it. Hence the term *progressiv*. There will be perhaps "ein unübersteiglich fixes Proximum" somewhere. For Friedrich this is temporarily *Wilhelm Mei-*

¹ *V. supra*, *Lyc. Frag.*, No. 120.

² *HRS.*, p. 252.

ster. But he dreams of advances even beyond this. If its genius had found perfect expression everywhere, if the pure spirit of *Wilhelm Meister* had attained a perfect form, that would have been absolute poetry. Since the absolute can have no varieties, no national subdivisions, no racial differentiations, no temporal modifications, this absolute poetry must be *Universalpoesie*.

What follows in this fragment is at the same time a characterization of *Wilhelm Meister* and a deduction from the ideal universal poetry. "Ihre Bestimmung ist nicht bloss alle getrennten Gattungen der Poesie wieder zu vereinigen, und die Poesie mit der Philosophie und der Rhetorik in Berührung zu setzen. Sie will und soll auch *Poesie und Prosa, Genialität und Kritik, Kunstpoesie und Naturpoesie* bald mischen, bald verschmelzen, *die Poesie lebendig und gesellig, und das Leben und die Gesellschaft poetisch* machen, den Witz poetisieren, und die Formen der Kunst mit *gediegem Bildungsstoff jeder Art* anfüllen und sättigen, und *durch die Schwingungen des Humors* beseelen. Sie *umfasst alles, was nur poetisch ist*, vom grössten wieder mehrer Systeme in sich enthaltenden Systeme der Kunst bis zu dem Seufzer, dem Kuss, den das dichtende Kind aushaucht in kunstlosem Gesang. Sie kann sich so in das Dargestellte verlieren, dass man glauben möchte, *poetische Individuen jeder Art zu charakterisieren sei ihr eins und alles*: und doch giebt es keine Form, die so dazu gemacht wäre, *den Geist des Autors vollständig auszudrücken*: so dass manche Künstler, die nur auch einen *Roman* schreiben wollten, von ungefähr sich selbst dargestellt haben."¹

Unity of spirit as against unity of form, unity of lesser parts as against unity of the whole are qualities common to Homer's epic and Goethe's *Roman*, as we have seen.

¹ Cf. also *Lyc. Frag.*, p. 89.

Romantic poetry alone can become a mirror of the world and the age. This is a third Homeric element of the new doctrine, and is also brought in *via Meister*. But the philosophic, reflective character of ideal poetry separates it heaven-wide from the Homeric epic. This is formulated into a demand for "Potenzierung der poetischen Reflexion." No. 255 likewise insists: "Der Dichter muss über seine Kunst philosophieren." Nothing is more apparent than that this is derived from Goethe's practice in *Wilhelm Meister*, and however absurd the demand that this involution shall proceed to such lengths that the work of art becomes an infinite series of mirrors of itself and its mirrorings *ad infinitum*, it is meant to find its justification in Goethe's *Roman*. This is clear from the characterization of Goethe's poetry as "Poesie der Poesie" (247), which is the first stage of "Potenzierung." Schlegel's peculiar habit of reflecting and then reflecting upon the reflection, and upon this second reflection, etc., until all feeling was dead and forgotten, is responsible for most of the fantastic folly of the romantic doctrines. Fichte had furnished a philosophy of philosophy, Goethe a poetry of poetry, and Schlegel himself a critique of criticism. Haym finds in this involution doctrine a transference of Fichte's philosophy into romantic æsthetics, but Goethe's poetry is always the "Anschauung" which gives fulness to the "Begriff." Fichte's philosophy may be a secondary influence, but self-reflection of poetry, as a doctrine, rests primarily upon Goethe's practice in the *Roman*.

All parts of a romantic whole must be capable of infinite development not only from within but from without. It need only organize the parts similarly, and like the Homeric epic and the Goethean *Roman* it has thereby a prospect of "grenzenlos wachsende Klassizität." In fact, the great advantage of romantic poetry is that it is always "im Werden," and never, like other kinds, "fertig." It is inex-

haustible by any theory, infinite, free, and its first law is "dass die Willkür des Dichters kein Gesetz über sich leide." This is just what is definitely affirmed in the *Übermeister* of the author of *Wilhelm Meister*. The poet's *Willkür* is his highest law.

Other fragments contain parallels to these doctrines, or are partial characterizations of Goethe's works, or are suggested by them. When Friedrich demands that everything in a poem shall be both end and means, he has the *Meister* in mind as his ideal (117). No. 297 was written with the hero of this *Roman* in mind. It is *Meister's* education which is characterized. The list of fragments closes with an ideal of universality which seems an attempt at climax, a proclamation, not merely of the harmony of *Kunstpoesie* and *Naturpoesie* which he found in Goethe's art, but of the final synthesis of poetry and philosophy which is elsewhere expressed as the synthesis of Goetheanism and Fichteanism.

II. *Ironie.*

One other doctrine of the new school may as well be considered here—the doctrine of *Irony*. Here again Haym has given us the essentials in respect to the development of the theory, and its place in romantic æsthetics. He shows in the use of this term a development parallel to that of the term *romantic*, and refers the latter stages of the development to the influence of Fichte's idealism. We need only add the caution that these philosophic influences should not be assumed as beginning very early. They were scarcely felt while Schlegel wrote his *Übermeister*, for the use of the term *irony* is there generally in accordance with the ordinary significance of the word. Yet the thing which is afterwards called *irony* is felt and expressed in different terms. For the time being Goethe's *Meister* is the great *Anschaung*

which led Schlegel to develop the idea of irony in the æsthetic field, and Goethe himself is the great art-Proteus, whom he idealizes in the fragment which characterizes the cultured man as able to put himself into any mood at will (*Lyc. Frag.* 55). When he says that the only philosophy remaining for the poet is "der schaffende," which originates in freedom and the belief in freedom, which shows that the human spirit impresses its law upon all things, and that the world is its art-product, he is thinking as much or more of the poet Goethe than of the philosopher Fichte. Schlegel says that *irony* has its home in philosophy. This is an after-thought. But for Goethe's poetic product, it is doubtful whether the developed doctrine of irony would ever have left the strict confines of its "home" and become colonized in "poetics." The earlier phases of this doctrine are distinctly literary, and are developed from Goethe's *Meister* and the dialogues of Socrates.

c. Goethe's Reception of the Athenäum.

The first number of the *Athenäum* was to be sent by Vieweg to Goethe on April 29. Goethe seems not to have left any record of the receipt of this copy, though he certainly received it in due time. Schiller received his copy on May 15, but did not look through it at once.¹ Goethe expresses no opinion of this first number. Its contents were almost wholly from the pen of August Wilhelm, and showed him in no radically new light. The reviews had a note of independence due to the fact that he was writing for his own journal. The literary quality was above the average and the whole stood quite plainly "im Zeichen Goethes." However, it was not likely to make any stir in the literary world.

¹ *GStBr.*, May 15, 1798.

The second number of the *Athenäum*, which was to be issued simultaneously with the first, was delayed until July. Schiller received a copy late in the month. On the 23rd he writes to Goethe: "Was sagen Sie zum neuen Schlegel'schen *Athenäum*, und besonders zu den *Fragmenten*? Mir macht diese naseweise, entscheidende, schneidende und einseitige Manier physisch wehe."¹

Two days later Goethe replies in favorable terms: "Das Schlegel'sche Ingredienz in seiner ganzen Individualität scheint mir denn doch in der *olla potrida* unsres deutschen Journalwesens nicht zu verachten. Diese allgemeine Nichtigkeit, Parteisucht fürs äusserst Mittelmässige, diese Augendienerei, diese Katzenbuckelgebärden, diese Leerheit und Lahmheit, in der die wenigen guten Produkte sich verlieren, hat an einem solchen Wespenneste, wie die Fragmente sind, einen furchtbaren Gegner Bei allem was Ihnen daran mit Recht misfällt kann man denn doch den Verfassern einen gewissen Ernst, eine gewisse Tiefe, und von der andern Seite Liberalität nicht ableugnen. Ein Dutzend solcher Stücke wird zeigen wie reich und wie perfektibel sie sind."²

On the 27th Schiller admits the earnestness and depth, but declares that the good loses its worth and utility by mixture with egotistical and repulsive elements. It is incredible that such persons as the Schlegels can have any real appreciation for Goethe's works, while their own show nothing but "Dürre, Trockenheit und sachlose Wortstrenge," "herzlose Kälte." They are not to be defended on the ground that they are fighting the enemies of Weimar classicism, because their excesses, their folly "wirft auf die gute Sache selbst einen fast lächerlichen Schein."³

¹ *Ibid.*, July 23, 1798.

² *Ibid.*, July 25, 1798.

³ *Ibid.*, July 27, 1798.

On the following day Goethe refers all further discussion to conversation. He would like to go through the Fragments with Schiller and discuss them.¹ This wish was fulfilled. In Goethe's journal under date of August 1, 1798, we find the record: "Bei Herrn Hofrath Schiller, über litterarische und poetische Angelegenheiten, besonders die Schlegel betreffend." No record tells us what the nature of this colloquy was or with what understanding it closed. It did close the incident, however, for no reference to the Schlegels occurs in their letters until March, 1799, when *Athenäum*, Vol. II, came to hand.

Goethe's interest in the *Athenäum* is testified to in the correspondence of Caroline,² who reports Goethe's efforts in behalf of the new Journal. These efforts were due to Böttiger's attempt to discredit the *Athenäum* on its first appearance.³ Goethe felt justified in preferring the Schlegels' journalistic method to that of his old enemy *Ubique*; and Friedrich professed to be content.⁴

β. *Athenäum*, Vol. II.

The second volume, No. 1, is largely the product of August Wilhelm, Caroline, and Hülsen. Friedrich contributes only *Über die Philosophie: an Dorothea*, and some notices of Schleiermacher's *Reden über die Religion* and Tieck's translation of *Don Quixote*. The latter do not concern us here.

In the opening essay, *Über die Philosophie*, Friedrich makes his first public utterances on philosophy and religion in somewhat more connected form. Certain fragments had treated Christianity as a form of religion, some had insisted upon the necessity of uniting philosophy and poetry in order to realize the highest culture, the eternal unity of life. But

¹ *Ibid.*, July 28, 1798.

² *WCB.*, Bd. I, pp. 215 f.

³ *GSB.*, July 25, 1798.

⁴ *WSB.*, p. 396.

now for the first time does the religious idea assume importance and demand a place in his system. This is the first fruit of his association with Schleiermacher.

The form of the essay is that of a letter addressed to Dorothea Veit, who was soon to become the consort of Friedrich, the muse of the *Lucinde*, and the faithful sharer of the wanderings and burdens of his checkered existence.

His first thesis is that the only *virtue* of woman is *religion*. This can be attained only through *philosophy*. Religion is, however, simply an instinct for divinity.

The works of Goethe shimmer through here and there. Almost in the beginning we have an earnest protest against *moral* education à la Goethe's old Italian in *Wilhelm Meister*, and then with conscious (?) characterization of the career of Meister, he adds: "Die Tugend lässt sich nicht lehren und lernen, ausser durch Freundschaft und Liebe mit tüchtigen und wahren Menschen und durch Umgang mit uns selbst, mit den Göttern in uns."

The world's idea of manhood and womanhood is like that of Sophie in the *Mitschuldigen*. "Es ist ein schlechter Mensch, allein es ist ein Mann." The true ideal of man and woman should subordinate sex characteristics to the higher elements of humanity. Man should become "sanft," and woman "selbständig."

In woman divinity and animality are perfectly blended. It is her function to bring harmony into life. This faculty of bringing harmony into life's discords is the faculty of religion, or rather *religion* itself. Here again Friedrich's words assume a strong likeness to the catechetic scene in *Faust*. "Wenn man göttlich denkt und dichtet und lebt, wenn man voll von Gott ist, wenn ein Hauch von Andacht und Begeisterung über unser ganzes Sein ausgegossen ist," then is one truly religious, and acts no longer from a sense of duty, but from love, because the God within him commands, and he wills it because God commands.

Poetry and philosophy are the paths which lead to this communion with the *Universe*. Dorothea stands like Hercules, or Wilhelm Meister at the parting of the ways, doubtful which to choose.

She does not enjoy pure poetry. She makes it a complement of life, enjoys the godlike thoughts and not the beauty *per se*. In reading Goethe's works she seeks this great content and not pure poetic form.¹ The purpose of poetry is to make our spirit at one with nature, philosophy is related to God. Poetry is concrete, philosophy abstract. Abstractions are divine because purified from all earthly reference. By abstraction the gods were made out of men. We see in the background of these contrasts Goethe and the Greeks for poetry, Fichte and Plato for philosophy. And when Schlegel adds, "Poesie und Philosophie sind ein untheilbares Ganzes, ewig verbunden," we have an expression of his highest humanitarian ideal, the union of Goetheanism and Fichteanism, which is *religion*.

Of course woman *has* poetry, and therefore *needs* philosophy as her only means of attaining the highest life. Schlegel proposes himself as a popular interpreter and complements of all past and extant philosophical systems. His philosophy he calls a philosophy for *Humanity*, and it has three cardinal principles: (1) The infinity of the human spirit, (2) the divinity of all natural things, and (3) the humanity of the gods. This betrays again the Goethean and Fichtean elements, though other systems contribute elements to the proposed hodge-podge of ideas.

Goethe's only reference to this number of the *Athenäum* is in a letter to Schiller, March 9, 1799, in which he expresses in general terms considerable interest.² This number contained the fine *Gemäldeggespräche* by August Wilhelm, and

¹ *RDBr.*, *Tagebuch für 1802*.

² *GSR.*, March 9, 1799.

it was this which so held the poet's interest, for Goethe thanked the elder brother in person at Jena for this number.¹

Goethe had no sympathy with the idea of womanhood in Friedrich's essay. He had no sympathy with the elevation of abstractions above concrete ideals, of philosophy above poetry. Elements of attraction there were without doubt. The emphatic individualism was perhaps one. As Goethe greeted Schleiermacher's *Reden* with favor, so he may have felt an interest in the similar tendency of Schlegel's essay. The bold proposal to interpret all systems of philosophy may have led to the few *colloquia* of the following year.

On August 10, the fourth number was sent to Jena, thus completing the volume for 1799. On August 16, Schiller writes to Goethe calling attention to the *Reichsanzeiger* (which was modeled on the *Xenia*), blaming the whole tone and especially the abuse of Schlegel's own friends. "Man sieht aufs neue daraus, dass sie im Grunde doch nichts taugen." August Wilhelm's *Elegy to Goethe* is a good but not faultless work, etc.²

Goethe's reply of the next day runs: "Wegen des Schlegelschen Streifzugs bin ich ganz Ihrer Meinung." We will not quote the whole, but two passages are particularly important. "Leider mangelt es beiden Brüdern an einem gewissen innern Halt, der sie zusammenhalte und festhalte. Ein Jugendfehler ist nicht lebenswürdig als insofern er hoffen lässt, dass er nicht Fehler des Alters sein werde." This passage can have no point unless Goethe felt that the faults of the Schlegels were fundamental and incorrigible. "Uebrigens lässt sich auch im persönlichen Verhältnis keineswegs hoffen, dass man gelegentlich ungerupft von ihnen wegkommen werde. Doch will ich es ihnen lieber verzeihen,

¹ *GWke.*, Abt. IV, Bd. 14, p. 54; Goethe to A. W. Schlegel, March 26, 1799.

² *GSBr.*, August 16, 1799.

wenn sie etwas versetzen sollten, als die infame Manier der Meister in der Journalistik." ¹ This passage has reference to past reviews of Friedrich as well as to present and prospective impertinences, and shows again the ground of preference for the *Athenäum* over Böttiger's journal, etc. This is thus an example of Goethe's "Beförderung dessen, was ich nicht mochte." ² More than a feeling of militant comradeship against common foes can hardly be inferred from the above passages.

That Schiller was correct in assigning the *Xenia* as the model for the *Anzeiger* is clear. That they were models for satiric fragments of *Athenäum*, vol. 1, is shown by August Wilhelm's fears lest they provoke parodies on all hands, by Friedrich's designation of the fragment on Wieland as *Xeniastisch*, and by August's characterization of them all as "eine sthenische Diät" and "gepfefferte Kritiken." ³

a. Religion and Morals; Ideen.

Before leaving Berlin to return to Jena, Friedrich took on a new phase of thought, the religious one, which remained with him more or less to the end of his life.

Friedrich Schlegel was not naturally and temperamentally religious. His earliest expressions show him to be *practically* atheistic. All conventional conceptions of God are given up. His ideal is to be his own God. Culture of the individual, "sich ausleben," is his ethical ideal. Morals of a revolutionary kind find occasional expression, but religion receives scarcely a word of mention in all his early correspondence. This fact is recognized by Haym, and by

¹ *Ibid.*, August 17, 1799.

² Goethe to Zelter, *v. supra*, note 2, p. 43.

³ *WSBr.*, p. 349; *Xenien*, Nos. 364, 365; *RNBr.*, p. 97.

Dilthey. Even Ricarda Huch, the enthusiastic interpreter and apologist of romanticism, admits that self-interest and not conviction led Friedrich to the Roman fold.

His earliest religious convictions are mere theories about religion, received from Kant and Fichte, and the religious confessions of the poets, chiefly of Goethe. We can affirm without hesitation that a natural undisturbed evolution of Schlegel's soul would never have produced a system of religious convictions or led to a life of religious observances. The same may be said of several external influences, his Hellenism, and Goethe-worship. Even Fichte can have aroused only a *theoretic* interest in conceptions of God. But now Friedrich was brought into intimate association with two men who were to affect romanticism profoundly, Hardenberg and Schleiermacher. To Schleiermacher's personal influence and his *Reden* may be accorded the primacy in this revolution. Hardenberg's naïvely religious soul influenced him secondarily.

The philosophic aspects of the religious problem and its practical bearings on the whole romantic movement had been already impressed upon the brothers by the difficulties of Fichte in Jena. In the spring of 1799,¹ Friedrich feels that Fichte's cause is theirs also, and proposes to write a *brochure* in order to prove that Fichte had *discovered religion*. August Wilhelm encourages him,² but a restraining force is the fear that such a publication might affect unfavorably his position in Jena, so near to Weimar, and to Goethe, whose influence had been paramount in the acceptance of Fichte's resignation.³ By May 7, 1799, we have the remarkable passage in which Friedrich proposes to *found a new religion*, which is to be the greatest birth of modern times, a movement which shall swallow up the French

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 416.

² *RNBr.*, January 12, 1799.

³ *WSBr.*, p. 416.

revolution, as primitive Christianity engulfed the Roman empire.¹

To a man gifted with so fertile a "Theorieneierstock," who considered world-revolutions as possible as a general change of opinions in himself, this seemed probable enough.

Hardenberg, the born mystic, *had* religion, and was to be the *Christ* of the new religion. Schleiermacher and Goethe were the concrete examples of its ethical counterpart, and Schlegel himself assumed the office of *Paul* of the new propaganda.

There were various reasons why Schlegel should choose this part, (1) his mere love of theorizing, (2) his need of fruitful literary materials, and (3) his overweening desire of leadership in the *whole* romantic movement, which at this moment began to include religion as well as philosophy and aesthetics. Friedrich proposed to produce a Bible for the new evangel, but in this he became utterly unintelligible to his *Christ*, and his fragmentary nature overcame his resolution.

In the meantime a series of fragments must constitute the new religious doctrines, just as the preceding *Athenäum* fragments were to constitute the æsthetic doctrines of a new school. These *Ansichten* (afterwards published as *Ideen*) were begun in August, 1799.

How the problem appeared to Schlegel at this time may be seen from his correspondence with Hardenberg. His Bible was to be "klassische Urbilder" such as the Greeks were for poetry, according to Goethe's practice. The new religion was not to swallow up philosophy and poetry. These *Urkünste* were to remain independently existing, justified in thus existing, though it was time they should exchange many of their qualities. The chief merit of Kant and

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 421. Cf. also *Ideen*, No. 94; *Ath.*, III, 1800.

Fichte is that they lead philosophy merely to the threshold of religion and then stop. Goethe's culture enters into the *Propyläen* of the temple from the opposite side. How unite them? By religion which enters the temple itself. "Giebt die Synthesis von Goethe und Fichte wohl etwas anders als Religion?" Their separation in life is purely personal and due to the improper relations of both to their age.¹

But to see further how he conceives this synthesis of Goethe and Fichte we must examine the *Ideen* of *Athenäum*, vol. III, for 1800, though it seems to involve a violation of our chronological study.

"Die Religion ist die all-belebende Weltseele der Bildung, das vierte unsichtbare Element zur Philosophie, Moral und Poesie" (4).² These four elements are inseparable, but not of equal rank (89). Philosophy and poetry must recognize their subordination to religion (42), for they are but different factors of religion (46). Poetry contributes to religion *Fülle der Bildung*, and philosophy *Tiefe der Menschheit* (57). Morals are also subordinate to religion (173). Religion and morals are symmetrically opposite, just as theory and *Anschauung* (67) or as human and divine things (110). Like religion, morals depends upon philosophy and poetry (62). Philosophy gives the *theory* of humanity, poetry the *intuition* of life in its fulness and ideal harmony. Religion is simply the pure theory of ideal humanity become fact in concrete life, with all its attendant feeling.

Philosophy is pure idealism. Poetry possesses the only realism. Until these are united there are no perfectly cultured individuals and no true religion (96). Religion cannot be induced by destruction of either of its elements.

¹ *RNBr.*, December 2, 1788. Fr. Schlegel to Novalis.

² Numerals refer to the numbers of the *Ideen* in *MS.*

Destruction of the philosophers and poets destroys religion itself (90).

“Jede Beziehung des Menschen aufs Unendliche ist Religion, nämlich *des Menschen in der ganzen Fülle seiner Menschheit*” (81). Here is a distinct Goethean element, this demand for the whole man. Schlegel’s God is not Fichte’s moral order of the universe, but “das Unendliche in jener Fülle gedacht, ist die Gottheit” (81). The deity is still “gedacht.” The reality of the universe is the reality which results from its inherent necessity in the subject, as with Fichte. As with Fichte, too, the world of the great poets of Weimar-Jena is the fullest and most original expression of the universe so posited,—the best example of “das Unendliche in jener Fülle gedacht.” But unlike Fichte, Schlegel has no moral rigorism.

Different imperfect individuals will have different types of religion (137). “Der religiöse Zustand des Poeten ist leidenschaftlicher und mitteilender.” Compare *Faust*, catechetic scene, admired also by Fichte. To get a perfect individual we must blend individualities, as for example, all members of a family, male and female, young and old. But as this is impracticable, we must go still to the great poets. “Es giebt keine grosse Welt als die Welt der Künstler. Sie leben hohes Leben.” They must be supplemented by philosophy. Nothing more can be done so long as philosophy and poetry are sundered. “Also ist die Zeit nun da beide zu vereinigen.”

The essential kinship of these doctrines with Schleiermacher’s religious views is apparent. The great difference theoretically is that Schlegel has a positive genius for confusion, and thus emphasizes the wholeness of the universe, the wholeness of humanity, at the expense of a clear perception of the parts and their relations. All things flow together in one and lines of demarcation are blotted out. The great-

est difference from Schliermacher, however, is the insistence upon Goethean culture of the individual as an essential element of religion.

γ. *Lucinde*.

Yet another product belongs to the period in Berlin—the notorious *Lucinde*.

Schlegel was at work upon a *Roman* as early as December, 1798. This was simply incredible to his most intimate friends. Hitherto he had been a critic and philologist, and had shown no inclination or capacity for creative art. Nevertheless the first portion of a *Roman* was sent to Jena, in January, 1799, for Caroline's critical inspection. By February 5, *Treue und Scherz*, a new chapter, is completed. Friends consider this a distinct falling off from the opening portions. This opinion does not entirely discourage him, and on March 2 he is able to announce to Schleiermacher the body of the *Roman* proper, *Lehrjahre der Männlichkeit*. By March 26, a considerable portion is already printed, but must be done over to reduce the cynicism, which Caroline found too pronounced. The first volume is complete in May, 1799. A second part is planned, but the harsh reception of the first, or his own want of talent, or a revulsion of feeling against his previous cynicism, or a combination of such causes, leads to its abandonment. Some poems, about fifty-nine in all, were produced for this second part, but the work itself never was completed. Thus we have only the fragmentary Part I of *Lucinde*.

Wilhelm Meister had been recognized as the highest type of modern art. A characterization of it had seemed equivalent to a treatise on art *per se*. Goethe had expressed approval of Friedrich's attempt to characterize it. Furthermore, a whole body of æsthetic doctrines had been derived by

him from Goethe's *Roman*, and these seemed to be creating a new æsthetic school which looked to Goethe as its *god*. Friedrich felt that he had founded this school on the side of *theory*, but he himself had demanded more of a real leader. Such a leader must be both *creative* and *critical*. He must prove himself such. Hence nothing is more natural, in spite of his utterly unpoetic nature, than that he should attempt to exemplify his own doctrines in creative art. This was all the easier, since the greatest arbitrariness was permitted the poet, and since the affair with Madame Veit had awakened his enthusiasm and given his life new meaning.

Didactic poetry had been condemned in the *Studium* as purely local, like the epic, and thus unjustifiable in modern times; but the Schlegels were never anything else than didactic themselves. This led them to emphasize the didacticism of all Goethe's works, and especially of *Wilhelm Meister*. The only limitation upon didacticism in the new æsthetics, is that it must be the spirit of the whole work.¹

The *Lucinde*, then, was first of all to be didactic. It was to found a new system of morals, just as the *Meister* of Goethe was a treatise on *Lebenskunst*.²

Goethe's objectivity is marked: "Er lässt die Menschen walten und hat seine Freude daran."³ The great realist Goethe is tolerant in his morals, and pictures scenes in social life in the most daring way, without expressing any judgment upon the characters or their actions. Vischer will have it that here and there Goethe oversteps the limits of the æsthetically permissible from his delight in sexual scenes.⁴ Schlegel had too distinct a theory concerning the proper sex-relations of men to women (cf. *Diotima*, *An Dorothea*, review

¹ *V. Ath. Fragment*, No. 111.

² *DWM.*, p. 80.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁴ Vischer, *Kleine Beiträge zur Charakteristik Goethes*. *G. Jahrb.*, Bd. iv, pp. 30 ff.

of Schiller's *Würde der Frauen*, etc.) not to feel that Goethe had left here unanswered a vital problem of any true *Kunst zu leben*.¹

The name *Lehrjahre* confesses a direct relation to Goethe's *Meister*. The new evangel is also Goethean in a general sense—*Natur*. Not in the large sense, of Nature, however. *Natur* in sex-relations is the specific theme of the *Lucinde*.

There was at that time a strong feeling among certain choice spirits that the marriage-bond, as a civil and canonical institution, was oppressive, unnatural, and altogether evil. Great laxity existed in the marriage relations at court and in all the best literary circles. The burning question was: "What is the true natural sex-relation?"

Schlegel undertook to answer it, and "das hohe Evangelium der ächten Lust und Liebe zu verkündigen." Schleiermacher's *Vertraute Briefe* give us the best insight into the intentions of the work. It is a book "wo die Liebe bis in ihre innersten Mysterien aufgesucht wird." "Die Liebe ist dem Werke alles in allem." "Die Liebe soll auferstehen . . . und die leeren Schatten vermeinter Tugenden verdrängen." Still more definitely in a long passage in which sensuality is defended as an integral part of love, and not a necessary evil to be endured through resignation to the will of God, nor "geistlose Libertinage" to be refined and humanized. Love need not be rescued in marriage, but its parties should dare to live on with no other bond than their own "sublime geistige Gemeinschaft." The *Lucinde* fulfils Schleiermacher's yearning "die göttliche Pflanze der Liebe einmal ganz in ihrer vollständigen Gestalt abgebildet zu sehen." "Hier hast du die Liebe ganz und aus einem Stück, das geistigste und das sinnlichste . . . in jedem Zuge aufs innigste verbunden."²

¹ *DWM.*, p. 85.

² *SVBr.*, especially first letter to Ernestine.

Friedrich Schlegel was much pleased at his friend's fine apology, but others were still inclined to think that the *Lucinde* had merely put "geistvolle Libertinage" in place of the "geistlose."

As a polemic against the restraints of love by the civil marriage-bond, this work was only too liable to exalt sensuality, to maintain, as Schleiermacher did in his apology, that "der Zustand des Genusses und der herrschenden Sinnlichkeit hat auch sein Heiliges," which demands equal respect with the condition of quiet reflection.

This excess of sensuality was favored by the nature of Schlegel himself. "Sinnlich bin ich sehr," he admits, but will not yield to gratification.¹ "Die Wollust liegt so tief in meiner Seele dass sie bei jeder Liebe sein wird. . . . Eine Liebe unter steter Entsagung wäre mir Qual." etc.² "Vielleicht bin ich *reiner* Liebe nur gegen Männer fähig."³ Consider, too, Friedrich's sympathy with the Greek "ἐταίπαί," his boundless delight in the most sensual works of the Greeks, the loves of Daphnis and Phyllis, commented upon in *Ath.*, vol. II, his profession of love for the *man* Shakespeare on reading the *Adonis* and *Sonnets*, simply because of their erotic character,⁴ his enthusiasm for Goethe's *Roman Elegies* chiefly for their erotic content. Add to this Grillparzer's testimony, with its final charge: "Dieser Mensch könnte jetzt noch einen Ehebruch begehen, und sich völlig beruhigt fühlen, wenn er dabei nur symbolisch an die Vereinigung Christi mit der Kirche dächte."⁵

The ethical doctrine of the *Lucinde* had to suffer from this defect of its author, for he was a subjective idealist who substituted for Goethe's "das Subject scheint Recht zu

¹ *WSBr.*, p. 10.

² *Ibid.*, p. 63 f.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁴ *HTBr.*, Bd. 3, p. 313; *Fr. Schlegel an Lud. Tieck*, July 27, 1798.

⁵ Grillparzer, 1822, cited *BLittgesch.*, Bd. II, pp. 86 f.

haben" the positive principle "Das Subject hat Recht," namely his *own* subject, however unideal and undisciplined.

In the study of *Wilhelm Meister*, Friedrich had evolved the doctrine that all novels are *personal confessions*. The *Lucinde* is to be such also. It cannot be so complex as *Wilhelm Meister*, but it does give genuine confessions of Friedrich's experiences with a Leipzig woman, with Caroline Böhmer, Dorothea Veit, and Schleiermacher.

To do this he had to overcome personal aversion to such revelations. He was the very opposite of frankness. He objects to all this "geheime Dichtkunst." He says: "aber ich für mein Theil würde nie im Stande sein, mein *innerstes Ich*, gleichsam als eine Naturseltenheit, die in einem Naturalienkabinett verwahrt wird, den Liebhabern vorzuzeigen."¹ In a *Lyceumfragment* he had said: "Sapphische Gedichte müssen wachsen und gefunden werden. *Sie lassen sich weder machen, noch ohne Entweihung öffentlich mittheilen.* Wer es thut, dem fehlt es zugleich an Stolz und an Bescheidenheit. An Stolz: indem er sein Innerstes herausreisst aus der heiligen Stille des Herzens, und es hinwirft unter die Menge, dass sie's angaffen, roh und fremd; und das für ein lausiges *Da Capo*, oder für *Friedrichs d'or*. Unbescheiden bleibt's immer sein selbst auf die Ausstellung zu schicken wie ein Urbild. . . . Nur Cyniker lieben auf dem Markte."²

Schlegel needed the *Friedrichs d'or*, and the applause of the crowd would have been welcomed, despite his scorn of them, but such motives are not the whole cause of the violation of this demand of sacred silence with regard to his affair with Dorothea Veit. The *example of Goethe* was most prominent among all the motives of it.

The Schlegels never doubted that the *Roman Elegies* were

¹ *WSBr.*, pp. 27 f.

² *Lyc. Fragment*, No. 119; *MS.*, Bd. II, p. 200.

so many disguised experiences of Goethe in Rome. *Der Gott und die Bajadere* was to them a confession of Goethe's relations to Christiana Vulpius, and they called him "Mahodöh" thereafter.¹ If Goethe's best works were such direct personal confessions of the most outspoken *erotic* character, why should not Schlegel's passion be detailed for the public enjoyment and admiration. His friends recognized this relation to Goethe. Novalis warned him that the public would say: "Aus Venedig ist Berlin geworden."

The *Roman* is to be a mixture of all literary forms. The *Lucinde* exemplifies this principle in the extreme. An introductory letter of Julius to Lucinde is followed by a dithyrambic fancy concerning the most beautiful situation, and this in turn by a characterization of little Wilhelmine. Now follows an allegory on impudence, an idyl on idleness, and sensual chitchat called *Treue und Scherz*. The *Roman* proper, a simple narrative, *Lehrjahre der Männlichkeit*, is abruptly broken off and gives place to more allegory in the form of *Metamorphoses*. Hereupon follow two letters, the first a mere series of fragments without visible unity. After these comes a reflection, as if there had not been enough of it and to spare already, then two polemic letters, a dialogue, and finally *Tändeleien der Phantasie*. Nothing is absent but *lyric verse* and genuine poetry. The second part would have furnished abundance of the former had it been completed.

A *Roman* must be reflective and contain comments upon its own art, just as *Wilhelm Meister*. It is only a high degree of this quality, when Julius is interrupted in the middle of his first letter in order to permit the writer (who of course is the hero) to reflect upon the manner of his confession and deliver a treatise on romantic confusion. The dithyrambic fancy is simply a reminiscent reflection upon

¹ *GuR.*, Bd. I, p. 7. A. W. Schlegel to Goethe, September 24, 1797.

imagined feeling in a situation conceived by tasteless wit. It is not necessary to *prove* the reflective character of the *Lucinde*, nor its character as an art-treatise.

The *Lucinde* was a practical fulfilment of all the doctrines derived from *Wilhelm Meister*, so far as it lay in Schlegel's power to fulfil them. There were, however, supplementary influences traceable to Tieck's *Sternbald* and Cervantes' *Novelas* and *Don Quixote*. Not only on the æsthetic side is this *Roman* arbitrary and fantastic, but ethically as well. Arbitrariness and fantastic opposition to all law and established custom are its whole spirit and tenor.

Here, too, Goethe is one of Schlegel's models. All in all, we can scarcely avoid the conviction that Goethe's free existence in the Weimar circle, his superiority to narrow convention in his domestic establishment, the tolerant morals of his poems and novels are the concrete examples which give fulness to Schlegel's ethical conceptions, as shown in the *Lucinde*.

Let us now examine this *Roman* for minor traces of Goethe's works. Donner finds it probable that Philline's character was influential upon the development of *Lisette*. He quotes a considerable passage beginning: "Ihr naïver Witz," etc.,¹ and calls it a characterization of Philline as she appears in Goethe's *Roman*. But even if this be so, he declares that a second model for *Lisette* must be assumed. Dilthey refers in general terms to "einem schlechten französischen *Romane*."² Julian Schmidt is more specific and refers to Prévost's *Manon Lescaut* as the second model.³ Yet Schmidt recognizes in *Lisette's* suicide because of Julius' unfaithfulness, the necessity of a third influence. As the Leipzig lady who was the object of Schlegel's violent passion

¹ *DWM.*, p. 96.

² *DLS.*, p. 491.

³ *SLittgesch.*, Bd. I, p. 395.

did not furnish this element, and as we know of nothing else in his earlier career to suggest it, it seems probably referable to some as yet unearthed literary source. Perhaps the tragic turn in Goethe's *Gott und die Bajadere* (which to Schlegel seemed a pure invention of the imagination injected into an actual experience of the poet, simply for artistic effect) or perhaps the tragedy in *Die Braut von Korinth*, which "made a new epoch in poetry," was enough to suggest a tragic end of some sort. Then again the *Bajadere* is elevated out of her class by *Mahodöh*, as *Lisette* by *Julius*.

Treue und Scherz is an attempt to reproduce the night scenes of Philline and Wilhelm, says Donner, and he rightly considers the *Idylle über den Müssiggang* as directly due to the passive nature of Wilhelm, who reaches the goal of culture by a complete surrender to external influences. The general resemblance of Julius to Wilhelm, however, is but slight and elusive.

Other Goethean influences shimmer through here and there. In the characterization of little Wilhelmine we have an example: "Und nun sieh! diese liebenswürdige Wilhelmine findet nicht selten ein unaussprechliches Vergnügen darin, auf dem Rücken liegend, mit den Beinchen in die Höhe zu gesticulieren, unbekümmert um ihren Rock und um das Urtheil der Welt. Wenn das Wilhelmine thut, was darf ich nicht thun, da ich doch, bei Gott! ein Mann bin, und nicht zarter zu sein brauche, wie das zarteste weibliche Wesen." Compare *Venetian Epigrams*:

39.

Kehre nicht, liebliches Kind, die Beinchen hinauf zu dem Himmel,
Jupiter sieht dich, der Schalk, und Ganymed ist besorgt.

40.

Wende die Füßchen zum Himmel nur ohne Sorge! wir strecken
Arme betend empor; aber nicht schuldlos, wie du."

When Julius says to Lucinde: "Ich weiss auch du würdest mich nicht überleben wollen, du würdest dem voreiligen Gemahle auch im Sarge folgen, und *aus Lust und Liebe* in den *flammenden Abgrund* steigen, in den ein rasendes Gesetz die *indischen Frauen* zwingt, und die zartesten Heiligthümer der Willkür durch grobe Absicht und Befehl entweiht und zerstört," we are clearly reminded of the *Bajadere*.

"Bei der Bahre stürzt sie nieder,
Ihr Geschrei durchdringt die Luft.
Meinen Gatten will ich wieder
Und ich such' ihn in der Gruft.
Soll zu Asche mir zerfallen
Dieser Glieder Götterpracht?
Mein! Er war es, mein vor allen!
Ach nur eine süsse Nacht!
.

Höre deiner Priester Lehre:
Dieser war dein Gatte nicht.
Lebst du doch als Bajadere,
Und so hast du keine Pflicht.
.

Und mit ausgestreckten Armen.
Springt sie in den heissen Tod."

When *Lisette* is described as "beinahe öffentlich" and her chief charms summarized as "ihre seltene Gewandtheit und unerschöpfliche Mannigfaltigkeit in allen verführerischen Künsten der Sinnlichkeit," we have a summary of the first three stanzas of the above poem. When Friedrich adds: "sie vergass beinahe der Kunst" when any man pleased her "und verfiel in eine hinreissende Anbetung der Männlichkeit," we have the fourth and fifth stanzas:

"Und des Mädchens frühe Künste
Werden nach und nach *Natur*.
.

Und sie fühlt der Liebe Qual."

In the *Allegorie von der Frechheit* we find a passage which seems at first a direct reference to *Wilhelm Meister*. Wit says to Julius: "Ich werde ein altes Schauspiel vor dir erneuern: einige Jünglinge am Scheidewege. Ich selbst habe es der Mühe werth gehalten, sie in müssigen Stunden mit der göttlichen Phantasie zu erzeugen. *Es sind die echten Romane vier an der Zahl und unsterblich wie wir.*" From the descriptions which follow we are tempted to try to determine what they are. The one which chose *Frechheit* for its muse is certainly the *Lucinde*. We might guess Goethe's *Meister* for that one which stood "mitten unter den Damen" and was "einer von denen, wie man sie gegenwärtig sieht, *aber viel gebildeter*;" "er unterhielt die Gesellschaft, und schien sich für alle (*i. e.* Sittlichkeit, Bescheidenheit, Decenz, Schöne Seele, and Frechheit) zu interessieren." What to make of the *Knight* and the *bathing Youth* is more doubtful, if we assume that they have already an objective existence, as the *Lucinde* and *Meister*. They would have to be symbols for Tieck's *Sternbald* and some work of Cervantes. If, however, Schlegel's own interpretation (as reported by Haym¹) is correct, and the only genuine *Romane* are four of his own projected works (a piece of colossal egotism hardly credible even in a Schlegel), then the problem is easier. The *Lucinde* is certain. The Knight with his mediæval catholicism and gigantic form, is Schlegel's *Faust*, which was to complete the *Faustfragment* of 1790, just as the *Lucinde* was to supplement the *Wilhelm Meister*. The third was to be a complete *Bildungsroman* of the type of *Wilhelm Meister*. The bathing youth is too vaguely sketched to suggest any definite content.

"Glaube mir," Julius says: "es ist mir bloss um die Objectivität meiner Leibe zu thun." Compare Goethe's *Roman Elegies* as a single poem, objectivizing Goethe's love experi-

¹ *HRS.*, p. 497.

ences in Rome, as the Schlegels believed. "Und weil es mir versagt ist *meine Flamme in Gesänge* auszuhauchen, muss ich *den stillen Zügen* das schöne Geheimnis vertrauen." The *Lucinde* must be all prose, though elegiacs had been more fitting. And if Julius must think of some world while making his confessions, "so sei es am liebsten die Vorwelt. Die Liebe selbst sei ewig neu und ewig jung, aber ihre Sprache sei kühn, nach alter klassischer Sitte, *nicht züchtiger wie die römische Elegie und die edelsten der grössten Nation.*" Compare *Roman Elegies*, XIII, where *Amor* says:

"Die Schule der Griechen
 Blieb noch offen, das Thor schlossen die Jahre nicht zu.
Ich, der Lehrer, *bin ewig jung*, und liebe die Jungen,
 Altklug lieb' ich dich nicht! Munter! Begreife mich wohl!
 War das Antike doch neu, da jene Glücklichen lebten!
 Lebe glücklich, und so lebe die *Vorzeit* in dir!
 Stoff zum Liede wo nimmst du ihn her? Ich muss dir ihn geben,
 Und den höhern Styl lehrt die Liebe dich nur!"

When Schlegel speaks of woman's love as follows: "Kein Linnée kann uns alle die schönen Gewächse und Pflanzen im grossen Garten des Lebens classificieren und *verderben*, und nur der eingeweihte Liebling der Götter versteht ihre wunderbare Botanik; die göttliche Kunst, ihre verhüllten Kräfte und Schönheiten zu errathen und zu erkennen, wann die Zeit ihrer Blüthe sei, und welches Erdreich sie bedürfen," etc., he has reference to Goethe, the great master of delineation of woman's character.

The passage in *Treue und Scherz*: "Wirst du nicht wenigstens erst den Vorhang niederlassen?—Du hast Recht, die Beleuchtung wird so viel reizender. *Wie schön glänzt die weisse Hüfte in dem rothen Schein!* . . . Warum so kalt, Lucinde?—Lieber, setze die Hyacinthen weiter weg, der Geruch betäubt mich.—*Wie fest und selbständig, wie glatt und wie fein!* Das ist harmonische Ausbildung.—O nein,

Julius! lass', ich bitt' dich; ich will nicht.—*Darf ich nicht fühlen*, ob du glühst, wie ich," etc., is a part of the fifth Roman elegy broken into prose dialogue:

"Und belehr' ich mich nicht, indem ich des lieblichen Busens
Formen spähe, die Hand leite die Hüften hinab?
Dann versteh' ich den Marmor erst recht," etc.

Julius' fatherhood and his enjoyment in being with his child are sharp reminders of Wilhelm Meister's relations to Felix.

The meeting of Julius and Lucinde is strikingly like the recognition scene in *Alexis und Dora*. Their feelings are awakened by music, the specifically romantic art, and their confession is brought about by this melodious exchange of feeling. "Er konnte nicht widerstehen, er drückte einen schüchternen Kuss auf die frischen Lippen und die feurigen Augen. *Mit ewigem Entzücken fühlte er das göttliche Haupt der hohen Gestalt auf seine Schulter sinken*, die schwarzen Locken flossen über den Schnee des vollen Busens und des schönen Rückens, *leise sagte er: Herrliche Frau; als die fatale Gesellschaft unerwartet hereintrat.*"

The situation and succession of events is exactly parallel to those of *Alexis und Dora*: (1) the recognition; (2) the embrace and kisses; (3) the "leise sagte er: Herrliche Frau" and "Ewig! sagte sie leise;" (4) the entrance of the company, and that of the ship's boy. We have seen how deep the impression was which Goethe's *Idylle* made upon him. This scene is the fruit of it.

If Schlegel had felt able to write verse, *Sehnsucht und Ruhe* would doubtless have taken the form of Goethe's "*der neue Pausias und sein Blumenmädchen*" instead of its present prose form.

The *Lucinde* was greeted with a great cry of indignation

from people of all schools, whether they had read it or not. Even the romantic circle condemned it. Goethe heard these condemnations, but seems not to have thought it worth while trying to form a closer acquaintance. Schiller is the first to give him a nearer knowledge of its nature and content. Schiller expresses his disappointment in finding none of the simplicity of the Greeks in it, after all Schlegel's *Rhodomontaden von Griechheit*. On the other hand it is "eine höchst seltsame Paarung des Nebulistischen mit dem Charakteristischen," "der Gipfel moderner Unform und Unnatur." He urges Goethe to read it for curiosity's sake. "Das Werk ist übrigens nicht ganz durchzulesen, weil einem das hohle Geschwätz gar zu übel macht."¹

Goethe replies next day: "Ich danke Ihnen dass Sie mir von der wunderlichen Schlegel'schen Produktion einen nähern Begriff machen; ich hörte schon viel darüber reden. Jederman liest's, jederman schilt darauf, und man erfährt nicht was eigentlich damit sei. Wenn mir es einmal in die Hände kommt, will ich's auch ansehen."

Goethe made no haste to gratify his curiosity. Not till two months later, September 19, 1799, do we find a record in his journal: "Abends *Lucinde* und Schelling's *Naturphilosophie*." And then he left no record of his impression in diary or correspondence. If he expressed an opinion orally, no one has recorded it for us. It is safe to assume that Goethe had and could have no sympathy whatever with its form or content, its purpose or tendency. His most tolerant attitude must be "eine gesunde Abneigung." Perhaps he reserved his opinions for public expression, possibly in the *Faust* satires.

¹ *GSR.*, July 19, 1799.

4. *Jena. Second Period.*a. *Social Relations, etc.*

Friedrich's stay in Berlin had been rendered unpleasant by the publication of the *Lucinde* and by differences with the rigoristic moralist, Fichte. Tieck, the poet *par excellence* of the romantic school, was intending to leave Berlin for Jena. It seemed possible now to reassemble the scattered school in Jena. So Friedrich arranged to return.

Goethe made frequent visits to Jena to escape the confusion of his domestic life and the demands of society in the Duke's capital, and to enjoy the quiet of the university town. One of these visits extended from September 17, 1799, to October 13. Goethe worked upon the translation of *Mahomet*, but found time for certain walks and occasional intercourse with others than Schiller. In his journal we find: "September 28, Nachmittags, Herr Friedrich Schlegel," and "October 12, Harland und Schlegel d(er) J(üngere)." The nature and purpose of these visits are not stated here or elsewhere. Dorothea writes in deep disappointment that he goes only to Schiller's, and others do not invite him, though the Schlegels see him every day at his old castle. She is inconsolable at her failure to see Goethe.¹ If we run through Goethe's diary of the period, this news is confirmed. August Wilhelm came to discuss the Roman elegies and the epigrams, and "Versmass" in general. Schelling came still oftener to discuss empiricism and idealism, and explain his own views of philosophy. The object of all visits by Schiller, August Wilhelm, and Schelling are clearly stated. The colorless mention of Friedrich Schlegel's presence on two occasions must imply that their chief meaning was a satis-

¹ *RDBr.*, to Schleiermacher, October 28, 1799.

faction of his own personal ambitions. They were of no consequence to Goethe.

Another visit to Jena occurred between November 11, 1799, and December 9. In the journal we have the record of one visit: "November 23, Friedrich Schlegel." Goethe was busied with his *Farbenlehre*. On Schiller's removal to Weimar, Goethe lived in almost absolute solitude in the quiet of Jena. This was broken only by a visit from Mellish, an evening at Loder's, and a reading of *Genoveva* by Tieck. Goethe discussed the *Natürliche Tochter* with August Wilhelm. We have again the same colorless mention of Friedrich. Before Schiller's departure many walks were taken, but no particulars are recorded in the diary of Goethe. On the other hand we have mention of this visit by Dorothea in a letter of November 15 to Schleiermacher. She reports meeting Goethe while on a pleasure walk "im Paradies." At the end of a long paragraph about Goethe's courtesy and her own pride she adds: "An Friedrich machte er auch ein recht auszeichnendes Gesicht, wie er ihn grüsste." To Rahel Levi she writes of the same circumstance, calling it "ein heller Punkt in meinem Lebenslauf."¹

In these two letters we have an expression of the boundless enthusiasm of the romanticists, the deification of the master Goethe, and the intense delight of the disciples in the least nod of recognition from Olympus. It is the feeling which Caroline expressed with respect to Goethe's *Propyläen*, "Was brauchen wir die Vorhöfe, da wir das Allerheiligste selber besitzen. Er lebt alleweil mitten unter uns."² But on Goethe's part there is nothing but an instance of his formal courtesy in this meeting. There is no trace of social intimacy. The meeting was forced upon him by a manœuvre

¹ *Ibid.*, November 15 and November 18, 1799.

² *RNBr.*, Caroline Schlegel an Novalis, November 15, 1798.

of the Schlegels. In the same letter we learn that Caroline gave out her intention of giving a "*Soupe*" which she hoped Goethe might attend. No evidence exists that such an invitation was ever accepted.

About this time two products of opposite character came into the hands of the Schlegels for publication in the *Athenäum*. These were Schelling's *Widerporst* and Novalis' *Christenheit oder Europa*. The authors were members of the inner circle of romanticism. The editors were in straits for want of manuscripts. The censorship, however, was strict, and doubts arose concerning the advisability of publishing such essays. All were in favor of publication except Dorothea, then August began to doubt, and finally Goethe was made umpire. The choice was appropriate, because Goethe knew the whole situation, the attitude of his government and the temper of the public since the affair with Fichte. Goethe's decision was against publication.¹

In rendering this decision he may have had other motives than those of mere prudence. He certainly opposed the whole spirit of the *Europa*, and probably felt it a prostitution of his power and position as well as a compromise of himself to permit such a glorification of mediæval catholicism and absolutism to see the light in a journal whose every third word was Goethe and Goethean art.

This decision was probably rendered on November 27, when Goethe records a talk with August Wilhelm on the relations of their society to the public. "Vivat Goethe!" Dorothea cries; "der ist . . . nach Weimar gereist, kommt aber in acht Wochen wieder, und hat gesagt, nun sie ihn so öffentlich und geradezu als Haupt einer Partei ausschreien, wollte er sich auch auf eine honette Weise als ein solches zeigen."²

¹ *RDBr.*, December 9, 1799.

² *Ibid.*

This promise of Goethe, here alone recorded, seems a direct recognition of the members of the romantic school as his disciples. In the absence of any evidence to show that Goethe really fulfilled such a promise, we may consider it as a misinterpretation on Dorothea's part of Goethe's courteous generalities, or an expression of a transitory hope on Goethe's part that he might help this party to steer clear of outer dangers, modify and restrain their false tendencies in art, etc., and so bind together all elements of opposition against the dominant Philistinism. He felt that the romanticists ought to be maintained as a fighting corps, though irregular.

Goethe kept up some sort of communication with Jena during the winter. He sent his poems in classic meters for August Wilhelm's criticism and suggestions, and adopted some of the latter. On one occasion Goethe expressed an interest in the intellectual output of August Wilhelm's *Geistesverwandten*, chiefly Tieck and Schelling.

The promised visit to Jena was delayed about seven months, and did not take place until July 22, 1800. In the meantime, however, Friedrich made several visits to Weimar. On April 10 he took the *Athenäum* containing August Wilhelm's satire on Schmidt, Matthison, und Voss, and read it to Goethe.¹ On April 28 Dorothea reports to Schleiermacher and Rahel a visit to Goethe: "Friedrich der Göttliche ist diesen Morgen zu Vater Goethe oder Gott dem Vater nach Weimar gewandert."² He started at five in the morning, in order to reach Goethe before his departure for Leipzig, where he arrived by four in the afternoon. The nature of these visits is not known, for they are not mentioned by Goethe in his journal, or in correspondence. On July 12, a visit is planned for Friedrich at his brother's request, as we learn, "um ein paar Stunden mit Ihnen schwatzen zu können."³ Goethe

¹ *Ibid.*, April 10, 1800.

² *Ibid.*, April 28, 1800.

³ *GuR.*, Bd. I. A. W. Schlegel an Goethe, July 12, 1800.

expresses his willingness to grant the favor on the following Wednesday, but we have no record of any such visit on that date or any other near it.

Friedrich seems to have waited until the third day after Goethe's arrival in Jena, when a call is noted in Goethe's diary with the usual simplicity. Every morning of this visit is devoted to *Tancred*, the afternoons are devoted to visits, etc. Almost a score of persons are mentioned in his diary. Among these Friedrich Schlegel is recorded three times, on the 28th, on the 30th, and on the 31st. On the 25th he had a long talk with Goethe, mostly literary and personal chitchat.¹ On the 28th he took one of his poems to Goethe, also *Aushängebogen* of the *Athenäum*.² We know nothing of the remaining visits.

Goethe's next visit to Jena was from September 3 to October 4, 1800, with the exception of a trip to Rossla from the 6th to the 10th. Two interests absorb Goethe's attention at this time, the Helena episode of *Faust*, and the philosophy of Kant and his successors. August Wilhelm is not in Jena. Humboldt is also absent. Hence Goethe turns to Friedrich instead for information regarding iambic trimeters and the meters of the Greek chorus. Philosophy is represented by Niethammer, at first a Kantian and later a Fichtean, now professor at the university, and by Friedrich Schlegel, who as "Privatdozent" has announced a course of lectures on philosophy. Fichte is permanently absent in Berlin, and Schelling temporarily so in Bamberg. It is to be noted that Goethe turns to Friedrich only because his trusted counselors are not at hand.

These interests bring Schlegel into Goethe's presence a number of times during the next several months. On the 5th of September he made a call. The diary records visits

¹ *WSBr.*, p. 431.

² *GSSBr.*, July 29, 1800.

on September 20, September 25, September 30, October 3, and November 11. These visits are the subject of correspondence on both sides. On September 16, September 23, and September 28, Goethe reports progress in his philosophical *colloquia* with Niethammer, and from these reports we have no reason to suppose that Schlegel has been consulted as yet on such subjects.¹ But on September 30 Friedrich Schlegel is mentioned as an exponent of transcendental idealism in these discussions. November 18 the muses are still in danger from the philosophers, but Goethe takes all the blame upon himself, for he has invited the gentlemen and set them to answering questions. By December 17, the philosophers are banished and the muses are again in favor.² The relative importance of Niethammer and Schlegel in this series of conversations may be seen in the ratio of the numbers of their conferences, *viz.* : 17 : 3.

Dorothea reports on September 30, 1800 : "Goethe ist noch hier. Er scheint nun mit Ernst etwas lernen zu wollen : er ist sehr fleissig, lässt sich ein Privatissimum nach dem andern lesen. Übrigens ist er auch sehr lustig und Friedrich hat neulich den Abend tête-à-tête mit ihm gespeist."³ These *privatissima* of course are not those of Friedrich alone, but those of Niethammer and the physicist Ritter as well. Friedrich notes on November 24 that Goethe had consulted him about the Greek name for his *Paleophron und Neoterpe*, and on Greek trimeters, etc. "Er hat einigemal recht viel darüber mit mir gesprochen, indessen habe ich mich doch nicht überwinden können, zu fragen nach dem Sujet."⁴ Goethe does not voluntarily confide in him, but uses his special knowledge of the Greek language and meters, and

¹ *Ibid.*, on dates mentioned in text.

² *Ibid.*, on dates mentioned in text.

³ *RDBr.*, Dorothea an A. W. Schlegel, September 30, 1800.

⁴ *WSBr.*, pp. 446 f.

the impertinent Friedrich has not felt himself privileged to inquire directly. Compare this with Goethe's free discussions of the Helena episode with Schiller in contemporary letters.

Goethe came to Jena again in December. Friedrich called on him to present him August Wilhelm's *Ehrenpforte für Kotzebue*, which Goethe praised "durch alle Kategorien."¹ Goethe sent this work to Schiller with the comment: "es ist nicht zu leugnen dass es brillante Partien hat."²

The next visit recorded is February 28, 1801, after Schlegel has taken the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Schiller gives Goethe an account of the scandal on that occasion, and Goethe expresses the hope that Friedrich may have some advantage from the contest, "denn freilich habe ich seine Gabe als Dozent, auch von seinen besten Freunden, nicht rühmen hören."³

Why should Goethe deliver this hearsay opinion, if those consultations in philosophy were of any importance? Why not his own personal judgment—to Schiller, at least?

A call on May 29 seems to have been the last personal meeting of the second Jena period.

If we examine these meetings as a whole, we note the complete reserve of Goethe as compared with his manner toward Schiller and Meyer, and even toward Humboldt, Knebel, Schelling, etc. There is nothing to contradict Schiller's letter of November 23, 1800, to Charlotte, Gräfin von Schimmelfmann. This summary of Goethe's character is so sound and wholesome, so sober, so earnest, so unmixed with personal feeling, that it carries conviction in those parts also which deal with the Schlegels. Among other things Schiller says: "*Dies Verhältniss ist durchaus nur ein litte-*

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 452.

² *GStBr.*, December 22, 1800.

³ *Ibid.*, March 18, 1801.

rarisches und kein freundschaftliches wie man es in der Ferne beurtheilt. Goethe schätzt alles Gute, wo er es findet, und so lässt er auch . . . dem philosophischen Talent des jüngern Schlegels Gerechtigkeit widerfahren: . . . an der lächerlichen Verehrung, welche die beiden Schlegels Goethe erweisen, ist er selbst unschuldig, er hat sie nicht dazu aufgemuntert, er leidet vielmehr dadurch, und sieht selbst recht wohl ein, dass die Quelle dieser Verehrung nicht die reinste ist: denn diese eitlen Menschen bedienen sich seines Namens nur als eines Paniers gegen ihre Feinde, und es ist ihnen im Grunde nur um sich selbst zu thun. *Dieses Urtheil, das ich Ihnen hier niederschreibe, ist aus Goethes eigenem Munde, in diesem Tone wird zwischen ihm und mir von den Herren Schlegel gesprochen. . . .* Insofern aber diese Menschen und ihr Anhang sich dem einreissenden Philosophie-Hass, und einer gewissen kraftlosen, seichten Kunstkritik tapfer entgegensetzen, ob sie gleich selbst in ein andres Extrem verfallen, insofern kann man sie gegen die andre Partei, die noch schädlicher ist, nicht ganz sinken lassen, und die Klugheit befiehlt zum Nutzen der Wissenschaft ein gewisses Gleichgewicht zwischen den idealistischen Philosophen und den Unphilosophischen zu beobachten.”¹

In respect to Goethe's philosophical interests, we find that he considered himself without the proper organ for speculation. The Kantian philosophy, however, had to be reckoned with. Schiller's friendship brought to him a system of æsthetics based on Kant, and the affair with Fichte brought him into practical contact with the whole movement. Gradually he yielded to the tendency to theorize, and began a course of reading in philosophy, which included the works of Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, among contemporaries. He consulted the personal representatives of the various systems

¹ *JSBr.*, Bd. vi, p. 219 f.

in order to obtain fuller explanations of technical terms and to ply them with questions.

At first Goethe's interest is chiefly æsthetic, and he finds little good to hope for from the new philosophy, and is positively opposed to idealism.¹ The most important thing for the philosophers is to reunite object and subject. Until that shall be effected, he will employ a rational empiricism as his own working theory.² In September, 1799, he complains of the insuperable limitations of the new school. "Sie kauen sämmtlich ihren eigenen Narren beständig wieder, ruminieren ihr *Ich*."³ To Schelling's *Naturphilosophie* Goethe is more attracted. It seems an attempt to reunite object and subject, but he is not ready to pass final judgment as yet on September 27, 1800, when beginning the *colloquia* with Niethammer.⁴

The conversations with Niethammer and Schlegel seem to have shown the more clearly the inner dissensions of the school, as is seen in a letter to Schiller in which he says: "Ich fürchte nur die Herren Idealisten und Dynamiker werden ehester Tages als Dogmatiker und Pedanten erscheinen und sich gelegentlich einander in die Haare gerathen;"⁵ and in another to Humboldt where he complains: "Schade dass die kritisch-idealistische Partei, *der wir schon so viel verdanken*, in sich selbst nicht einig ist, und das Grundgute ihrer Lehre, das ohnehin so leicht misgedeutet werden kann, mit Übermuth und Leichtsinne zur Schau stellt."⁶ These are references to the Schlegel-Niet-

¹ *GSR.*, November 25, 1797, and January 6, 1798.

² *Ibid.*, February 21, 1798.

³ *GWke.*, Abt. iv, Bd. 14, p. 179. Goethe an Wm. von Humboldt, September 16, 1799.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Bd. 15, p. 117. Goethe an Schelling, September 27, 1800.

⁵ *GSR.*, September 16, 1800.

⁶ *GWke.*, Abt. iv, Bd. 15, p. 147. Goethe an Wm. von Humboldt, November 19, 1800.

hammer and possibly to Schlegel-Schelling contests, which seemed so inexcusable to Goethe.

Goethe seems to have hoped for an ultimate unity among philosophers upon a system which should recognize the unity of object and subject. Compare the Baccalaureus scene of *Faust*, Part II, which was composed at this period of Goethe's activity. This scene is hardly a representation of mere youthful insolence in general, and certainly not a mere fulfilment of Mephisto's promise that the young fellow should become "sicut deus." The reference to Fichte's philosophy is too specific to admit of any doubt:

"Original, fahr' hin in deiner Pracht!
Wie würde dich die Einsicht kränken;
Wer kann was Dummes, wer was Kluges denken,
Das nicht die Vorwelt schon gedacht?
Doch sind wir auch mit diesem nicht gefährdet,
In wenig Jahren wird es anders sein:
Wenn sich der Most auch ganz absurd gebürdet,
Es giebt zuletzt doch noch e' Wein."

There is a conservative tendency in all Nature's activities. The youth, and the young philosophical revolution, will both settle into soberness and sense with years. How much of this hope of returning clearness and sanity was based on Friedrich Schlegel's vague system of real idealism, as known to Goethe, is at present indeterminable. Probably but little, if any, for his hopes seem to have lain rather in a clarification of Schelling's *Naturephilosophy*.

β. *Athenäum*, Vol. III.

a. *Gespräch über die Poesie, etc.*

Schlegel's literary work of the Jena period consisted of his *Gespräch über die Poesie*, a poem *An Heliodora*, a parting word to his critics, *Über die Unverständlichkeit*, and

Herkules Musagetes; the first three appearing in the *Athenäum* for 1800, and the last in *Charakteristiken und Kritiken*.

The poem *An Heliodora* does not concern us at all. The *Gespräch* is most important. It is modeled upon Goethe's manner in the *Propyläen*,¹ and consists of *Epochen der Dichtkunst*, *Rede über die Mythologie*, a *Brief über den Roman*, and a *Versuch über den Verschiedenen Styl in Goethes frühern und spätern Werken*.

The *Epochen* attempts to do over again, what had been done so confusedly and imperfectly in the *Studium*, viz., to show the relations of modern poetry to the ancient, and trace the development of the former. The great change from the position taken in the *Studium* is shown in the fuller treatment of the modern periods and the unstinted praise of certain modern poets, as Dante, Shakespeare, Cervantes, and Goethe. The latter is still the only German poet to be named with Shakespeare and Dante. Goethe's universality is emphasized.

The moderns are now superior to the ancients, even the poets of Athens, because the union of poetry and philosophy has introduced a new period of development in art. The Germans need only employ these means, and follow the models of Goethe, and seek the spirit of German art in the *Niebelungen-Lied*, etc., in order to attain the highest possible art.

But poetry needs a *Mythology*. It is time to make a new one. It is to be born out of the deeps of the soul itself. Fichte's idealism is to be its basis, and Ritter's *Transcendental Physics* is to help in its development. Out of idealism must eventually come an infinite realism. But philosophy can not express this realism. Poetry alone can. In fact, all beauty, though concrete, is likewise symbolic. We seem to have here again an instance of the union of Fichteian-

¹ *CuR.*, pp. 218 f.

ism and Goetheanism, but Schlegel is passing beyond that *stadium*. Goethe is not mentioned at all, but Friedrich longs for access to the mythology of the orient—the true home of fantasy and mysticism. This is the burden of the *Rede*.

The *Brief über den Roman* is a supplement to the aesthetic fragments of *Athenäum*, vol. I. In these fragments already Tieck's *Lovell* and *Sternbald*, Jean Paul's *Siebenkäs*, and Cervantes' *Don Quixote* and *Novelas* were considered, though all were subordinated to the one overshadowing *Roman*, *Wilhelm Meister*.

In a sort of defense of Jean Paul, Friedrich gives a formal definition of the romantic: "*nach meiner Ansicht und nach meinem Sprachgebrauch ist eben das romantisch was uns einen sentimentalischen Stoff in einer fantastischen Form darstellt.*"

The *sentimental* is a spiritual feeling whose source is love. "Der Geist der Liebe muss in der romantischen Poesie überall unsichtbar sichtbar schweben." All of this love must be simply "eine Hindeutung auf das Höhere, Unendliche, Hieroglyphe der ewigen Liebe und der heiligen Lebensfülle der bildenden Natur."

This is a new order of poetry which has left the *Wilhelm Meister* lagging far behind. The "*organ*" of this new art is the "Phantasie" which strives to utter in riddles the ineffable divinity of life. This art makes no distinction between play and earnest, semblance and truth; it rests on historic grounds almost entirely, including personal confessions in the term historical grounds, and permits, nay demands, free play of the author's own personality, his humor and reflection. It is purely *subjective*. In this respect, too, it has abandoned Goethe's views.

Again, this art does not look to the *future* for its perfection, as Schlegel proclaimed, when he characterized Goethe's art as the "Morgenröthe echter Kunst." Its ideal is now the

art of the *elder* moderns, of Shakespeare, Cervantes, Dante, Tasso, Ariosto, Petrarca, Boccaccio, Calderon, and Lope, and that "Zeitalter der Ritter, der Liebe und der Märchen, aus welchem die Sachen und das Wort selbst (romantisch) stammt." This is the only modern period to be compared with Greece, and the romantic movement with this specific ideal is the only justifiable modern art, unless we return to antiquity itself. Goethe is thus justified in his classicism, but really excluded from the new school.

The romantic is not a *genus* of poetry, but an *element* in *all* poetry. A *Roman* then is simply "ein romantisches Buch,"—a thing to be read, not seen as a drama nor heard as an epic. A *Roman* in this narrow sense is "ein angewandter *Roman*" in the wider sense. Its unity is spiritual only. It involves a mingling of all forms, as shown by the practice of Cervantes.

The fundamental forms of romantic art are the *Novelle* and *Märchen*, and Friedrich wishes that some genuine artist might create a number of these, so that he might deduce their laws.

Romantic criticism should partake of romantic confusion in the highest degree, and become a *Roman* itself.

In this whole letter Goethe's name is not mentioned, nor is that of any one of his works. The *Wilhelm Meister* is scrupulously, even studiously avoided, while a year earlier it would have been dragged in under every slightest pretext. Goethe is outgrown. The scales have fallen from Schlegel's eyes. *Wilhelm Meister* no longer appears the divine example of "progressive Universalpoesie." It has been surpassed already by Tieck's *Sternbald*, which is "der erste *Roman* seit Cervantes, *der romantisch ist, und darüber weit über Meister.*"¹ Tieck's style is romantic and superior to Goethe's splendid prose. Friedrich has gone so far in his progress toward the

¹ *WSBr.*, p. 414.

modern that August Wilhelm now seems "gar zu teufelmässig antik."

We must not omit to note in passing that Schlegel's production of the *Lucinde* seems to be reflected in his high praise of the fantastic and the confusion of the *genera*.

Such are the facts of this revolution in respect to Goethe. What are its motives?

First, Schlegel's original disposition to domineer. This was held in check by prudential motives until Goethe's patronizing tolerance seemed to be a recognition of his rising importance, and his position as spokesman of the new school seemed assured. His original imperiousness returned and Goethe had to be quietly shoved aside.

Secondly, Schlegel had published the *Lucinde*, which turned out to be more fantastic and lawless than he himself anticipated. Since no one else defended it, it seemed best to defend it himself by enunciating æsthetic doctrines which it did truly exemplify.

A third consideration was the fundamental unity and clearness in Goethe's works, the constant dominance of the artistic purpose. Goethe's intensified interest in the plasticity of poetry was really foreign to Friedrich Schlegel's mental constitution. It was as inevitable that Schlegel should forsake the classic Goethe as that he should forsake the Greeks. His course lay toward the mystic *orient*.

But Goethe's works are still a fascinating problem. His universality is still amazing, and, though his life-work is not yet finished, Friedrich proposes to apply the historic method of criticism to Goethe's works, so far as known. This he does in his *Versuch*.

The extreme differences between Goethe's earlier and later works are noted as exceptional. Goethe has passed through three stages of development. *Götz* is the type of the first, *Tasso* of the second, and *Hermann und Dorothea* of the third.

All are highly objective. *Werther* has admirable details, excludes everything accidental, moves direct to the goal, but sinks below *Götz* with its German knights and its formlessness. *Werther's* "Ansicht der Natur" prophesies the future naturalist Goethe. *Faust* is a revelation of Goethe's self, and so belongs to all periods. It belongs "zum Grössten, was die Kraft des Menschen je gedichtet hat." The *Clavigo* and other lesser works are remarkable as examples of self-limitation for artistic purposes.

The *Iphigenie* is a transition from the first period to the second.

In *Tasso* everything is antithesis and music, and the fine smile of court life lights up all. Everything rests upon an ideal of harmonious life and harmonious culture. *Egmont* is a pendant to *Tasso*. "Auch hier unterliegt eine schöne Natur der ewigen Macht des Verstandes." The *Claudine von Villa Bella* represents in Rugantino the romantic life of a gay vagabond. *Egmont* is a study after Shakespeare's Roman plays, and *Tasso* a study after Lessing's *Nathan*; just as *Wilhelm Meister* is a study after a host of *Romane*, which taken jointly and severally had no validity. Friedrich hastens to assure us that such imitation is eminently proper. In fact no true work of art can exist without it. The model is simply an incentive to more complete individualization of the artist's thought. This seems like an intentionally inserted excuse of the *Lucinde*, or of this whole "Gespräch" itself.

Wilhelm Meister has qualities of both earlier periods, but above all it has the classic spirit of the third. The inner antiquity of *Reineke Fuchs* places it in the third also. The *Elegies*, *Epigrams*, *Idyls*, and *Epistles* make one poetic family, or one poem characterized by antique form, but having as their principal charm their lyric quality.

In the first period the subjective and objective are thor-

oughly blended; in the second the execution is thoroughly objective, but the content shows reference to a distinctive individuality; in the third the works are wholly objective. What seems naturalness in them is purely a product of conscious art.

In concluding, Friedrich reverts to the *Wilhelm Meister*, and emphasizes once more the combination of the antique and the modern in it. "Diese grosse Combination eröffnet eine ganz neue endlose Aussicht auf das was die höchste Aufgabe aller Dichtkunst zu sein scheint, die Harmonie des Classischen und Romantischen." Here is the motive to Schlegel's unfortunate *Alarkos*.

Goethe, Shakespeare, and Cervantes are alike in universality, but Goethe alone lives in an age favorable to the founding of a school. German spirit must take a direction toward this goal; and Schlegel hopes that poets will not be wanting to follow Goethe's models. If these can make Goethe's "universelle Tendenz" and "progressive Maximen" their own and apply them in art, "*wenn sie wie er das Sichre des Verstandes dem Schimmer des Geistreichen vorziehen*," then Goethe shall become the head of a new school, the dominant spirit of our age, as Dante was for the middle ages. This sound peroration was, however, *irony*, or worse, in the mouth of Friedrich Schlegel, for it does not represent his real convictions. The whole tone of this essay, as well as its more enthusiastic praise of Goethe, seems to indicate that it was written much earlier than the *Brief über den Roman*, in fact, about the period of the *Übermeister*, or shortly thereafter, before he wrote the *Lucinde* and became fully committed to the fantastic and formless. A notable feature already is the attempt to treat Goethe historically rather than as a *canon* of present art.

Schlegel's *Athenäum* had provoked attack on account of

its unintelligibility. This was no serious objection in Friedrich's eyes, for language is too imperfect to express all the shades of thought and feeling in men who are exploiting the *chiaro oscuro* of the German *Gemüt*, who are cultivating the hitherto neglected fallow-ground of the unconscious. Moreover the reader himself must have a certain experience and training in order to understand his author. So Friedrich satirizes the critics mercilessly, reminds them that Goethe's poetry and Fichte's idealistic philosophy are the two centers of German culture, that these facts are known to every body, but cannot be too often repeated. "Goethe und Fichte" is the formula for all offense given by the *Athenäum*. But these names will have to be named over and over again. To make a beginning Friedrich inserts his brother's sonnet,

"Bewundert nur die feingeschnitzten Götzen," etc.,

with its ingenious play upon the name Goethe, in other respects a work without a spark of divine fire in it, but which shows perhaps better than anything else could the immeasurable gulf fixed between the master and the professed disciple.

The doctrine of irony is redefended, and progress is predicted to a point of vantage from which every reader will find the *Lucinde* innocent, Tieck's *Genoveva* protestant, and August Wilhelm's didactic elegies too easy and transparent. This progress is conditioned upon the outbreak of "viel verborgene Unverständlichkeit," such as that of the *Athenäum*. Goethe could hardly have been particularly delighted to find the obscurities and inconsistencies of the *Athenäum* credited wholly to himself and his literary movement. But then Schlegel was desperate in defeat.

γ. *Poetical Activities.*

α. *Herkules Musagetes.*

Herkules Musagetes is a personal confession dating from the Jena period. It is written in elegiac verse, modelled on that of Goethe's *Roman Elegies*, for a casual comparison of its structure, metrically considered, reveals its kinship with Goethe's *Hexameters* rather than those of stricter schools.

This bit of verse is a declaration of the coming of age of the romantic school. Lessing and Winckelmann left their legacy to Goethe, and Goethe, though a great living representative of German culture, is withdrawn to a solitary Olympus. Tieck, Novalis, August Wilhelm Schlegel, Schleiermacher, Fichte, Ritter, these are now the "treue Pilaster der Kunst." Friedrich expresses his joy in his own recently discovered creative (?) talent. Books and the midnight lamp are the foundations of art, and Friedrich himself, as aesthetic lawgiver as well as creator, assumes the leadership of the school in the rôle of *Herkules Musagetes*.

Spanish poetry, French knightly poetry, and oriental hyperbole, have assumed a much wider place in his art-theories. In like proportion the sober Goethe has sunk to a secondary place in the romantic circle.

Not only in this literary work do we find evidence of this change. Even more occurs in contemporary letters. One suspects that Goethe has shown himself too little responsive to the new leadership to suit the wishes of our overweening dictator. The old critical attitude has come back. Goethe is too prosaic. Goethe's *Propyläen* are now privately branded as harmful to art.¹ Tieck's style is superior to Goethe's, because of its music in contrast to the plasticity of the latter.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 464.

Tieck's *Ein schön kurzweilig Fastnachtsspiel vom alten und neuen Jahrhundert* is composed in accordance with better principles than Goethe's *Paleophon und Neoterpe*, etc.¹

b. *Alarkos*, etc.

Through the experiments in verse-making, such as *An Heliodora*, *Herkules Musagetes*, and the fifty-nine pieces of verse intended for the second part of *Lucinde*, Friedrich is convinced that he possesses poetic powers of a high order. He is very glad, for whatever he may have declared about the equality of the critic with the creative artist, it was never his genuine conviction, even in the period of disbelief in his own creative powers. Now criticism must be subordinated to production. His motto is, "*nulla dies sine linea*." He indulges in *terza rima*, sonnets, trochaics, elegiacs, iambics, everything which may be attained by a purely formal "Vers-talent," all of which posterity has generously forgotten or forgiven.

One work was destined to make a ripple in the dramatic world—his *Alarkos*. The leader of the new school ought to show such universality as the old leader, Goethe. He had shown himself productive in the *Roman*, the *elegy*, the *lyric*, and the *epigram*. It yet remained to rival Goethe in the *drama*. Or rather outdo him? He would make a drama according to the true romantic recipe. It should surpass anything hitherto seen upon the stage, because it was to avoid the onesidedness of the purely classical drama or of the purely romantic. Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* was a modern subject filled with the antique spirit. The *Iphigenie* was an antique subject, in antique form, but filled with the modern spirit. The new drama, which was to be a perfect harmony of the classic and romantic, must go even further.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 462.

The subject should be modern with antique spirit, and the form should be a mingling of all forms, lyric, epic, and dramatic.

The result was *Alarkos*, a Spanish subject, tragic in the antique sense according to the early type of Aeschylus, but tricked out in a motley dress of antique-modern cut.

August Wilhelm had produced *Jon*, a simple modernization of Euripides' *Jon*, in this respect a more or less clearly recognized imitation of Goethe's *Iphigenie*. Friedrich's *Alarkos* was stimulated by Goethe's drama, but just as the *Lucinde* was to be a corrective or supplement to *Wilhelm Meister*, so the *Alarkos* was to supplement the *Iphigenie* by showing the complete harmony of the ancient and the modern.

Early in 1802 Goethe had the *Alarkos* in hand and was preparing to bring it out on the Weimar stage. To August Wilhelm he praises its *Gedrängtheit* and prefers it to Tieck's *Genoveva*.¹ On May 3 additions are asked for from the author, and two days later stage-director Kirms assigns the parts.²

The preparation falls chiefly to the lot of Schiller, while Goethe is in Jena. Schiller foresees certain defeat in this attempt to put *Alarkos* on the boards. The opposing party will be given an opportunity to deride them. "Einen Schritt zum Ziele werden wir durch diese Vorstellung nicht thun, oder ich müsste mich ganz betrügen." He will consider themselves lucky if they escape "eine totale Niederlage."³ Goethe replies at once: "Über den *Alarkos* bin ich völlig Ihrer Meinung; allein mich dünkt, wir müssen alles wagen, weil am Gelingen oder nicht-Gelingen nach aussen gar nichts liegt. Was wir dabei gewinnen scheint mir hauptsächlich das zu sein, dass wir diese äusserst obligaten Sylben-

¹ *GWke.*, Abt. IV, Bd. 16, p. 75. Goethe an A. W. Schlegel.

² *Ibid.*, p. 74.

³ *GSBr.*, May 7/8.

*masse sprechen lassen und sprechen hören. Übrigens kann man auf das stoffartige Interesse doch auch was rechnen."*¹ Schiller promises to do his best, but is by no means reassured.²

The play was finally produced on May 29, and would have been laughed off the stage, if Goethe's personal presence and vigorous efforts had not subdued the audience. Goethe's own utterances in the *Tag- und Jahreshefte für 1802* is as follows: "Über alles Erwarten glückten die Vorstellungen von *Jon* (January 4), *Turandot* (January 30), *Iphigenie* (May 15), *Alarkos* (May 29). Sie wurden mit grösster Sorgfalt trefflich gegeben: *letzter konnte sich jedoch keine Gunst erwerben.* Durch diese Vorstellungen bewiesen wir, dass es Ernst sei alles was der Aufmerksamkeit würdig wäre einem freien reinen Urtheil aufzustellen." If Goethe was thinking clearly of the inclusion of Schlegel's *Alarkos* in this group of plays which succeeded beyond all expectation, his last statement above is somewhat remarkable in view of the acknowledged suppression of all opposition to both *Jon* and *Alarkos*.³

The Countess of Egloffstein reports the occurrences at the representation of *Alarkos*. At a certain passage a wild laughter burst out so that the whole theater trembled with it. "Aber nur einen Moment. Im Nu sprang Goethe auf, rief mit donnernder Stimme und drohender Bewegung: 'Stille! Stille!' und das wirkte wie eine Zauberformel. Augenblicklich legte sich der Tumult, und der unselige *Alarkos* ging ohne weitere Störung, aber auch ohne das geringste Zeichen des Beifalls zu Ende."⁴ Genast reports that Goethe expressed himself as satisfied with the representation, but one could see that he was in ill-humor.⁵ Goethe himself

¹ *Ibid.*, May 9.

² *Ibid.*, May 12.

³ *G Wke.*, Abt. I, Bd. 35, p. 120. *Tag- und Jahreshefte*.

⁴ *BGG.*, Bd. I, pp. 234 f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 235.

excused the whole affair to Madame de Staël in 1804 as simply a "Kunstversuch."¹ Schiller wrote to Körner, July 5, 1802: "Mit dem *Alarkos* hat sich allerdings Goethe compromittiert: es ist seine Krankheit, sich der Schlegels anzunehmen, über die er doch selbst bitterlich schimpft und schmählt. Das Stück ist aber hier nur einmal und völlig ohne allen Beifall gegeben worden."²

Goethe's behavior was considered an evidence of active support and friendship of the greatest practical value by Friedrich himself, possibly by others. From this distance of time, and with the records before us, the favor of Goethe for the *Alarkos* looks more like the reflex of Goethe's hatred of Kotzebue and Co., than real approval of Schlegel. Compare the account of the whole affair given by the Countess of Egloffstein.³

GENERAL MATTERS.

C. FAUST: *Walpurgisnacht* SATIRES.

The *Walpurgisnacht* scenes were written from the fall of 1800 to the spring of 1801. MS. dates are November 5, 1800, to February 8/9, 1801.⁴ The *Walpurgisnachtstraum*, a continuation of the *Xenia*, was produced in its first form June 4/5, 1797.⁵ By December 20, this increased to double its size.⁶ There is no reason to suppose that additions were not made from time to time as occasion for satires arose. Additions were made at the very last moment.

We must examine these works carefully for any satires on Friedrich Schlegel. No other contemporary works of Goethe give occasion to introduce literary satire.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 258.

² *JSBr.*, Bd. VI, p. 400. Schiller an Körner, July 5, 1802.

³ Goethe's *Cours d'amour*. *G. Jahrb.*, Bd. VI, pp. 65 ff.

⁴ *MF.*, Bd. II, p. 236.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 260.

Minor's *Faust* is the latest scholarly attempt to interpret these satires. Baumgart's *Faust, als einheitliche Dichtung* contains another attempt. Veit Valentin's *Goethes Faust-dichtung* attacks the same problem, and Witkowski's *Walpurgisnacht* treats the scene as a whole in its formal aspects, but gives little attention to exegesis. Earlier commentators are in general superseded.

Demonstration is generally out of the question when we seek distinct personalities under any of the allegorical masks of the *Walpurgisnacht* proper. The *Kranich* is Lavater, the *Proktophantasmist*, Nikolai, the *Orthodoxe*, Stolberg, the *Idealist*, Fichte or a Fichtean, the *Autor*, probably Wieland or Herder, and the *Genius der Zeit* Henning's Journal of that name. But all attempts to find such personalities behind the *Dudelsack*, *Irrlicht*, *Halbhexe*, *Windfahne*, etc., must remain very uncertain. Goethe himself has said about them: "Was darin von Piquen vorkommt, habe ich so von den besonderen Gegenständen abgelöst und ins allgemeine gespielt, dass es zwar dem Leser nicht an Beziehungen fehlen, aber niemand wissen wird, worauf es eigentlich gemeint ist."¹ We shall be lucky if we escape the Goethean condemnation of "was unterzulegen" in our attempt "alles auszulegen."

In the *Traum*, however, which is a continuation of the *Xenia*, we must suspect distinct personalities under most of the allegorical masks.

Did Friedrich Schlegel and the tendencies with which he was identified find a place on the Blocksberg?

If Baumgart is correct, Goethe intended to characterize the evil principle in its entirety, and disposed his materials in three great groups: the first, *Evil* in its absolute opposition to moral law; the second, *Evil* in more specialized form

¹ *GGE.*, March 21, 1830 = *BGG.*, Bd. VII, p. 276.

as the essence of corruption in society and State ; and third, *Evil* as falsity and perversity in art, science and literature. The great primal sources of corruption, *Mammon*, and *Frau Baubo*, gold and sex, the catholic misuse of absolution, and the protestant degeneration, fill the whole of Goethe's poem up to the point where Faust and Mephisto step aside into the circle of campfires "in die kleine Welt." In this little world Goethe describes a decadent society. Instead of going into details the poem strikes at the single root of the whole evil, the tendency to cling to the old. To give concrete expression to this principle certain typical individuals are made to utter their opinions, *e. g.*, the General and the Minister who grumble at innovations, the Parvenu who wishes innovations to cease when he is at the top, the author, who, like Herder, stands fretfully aside and carps at the new classicism, or Wieland, who sees the golden age of German literature rise and decline with his own fame. This *Beharren beim Alten* is further symbolized by the *Trödelhexe* who collects and preserves all old instruments of crime and corruption. But the chief instrumentality of destruction for the society is frivolous lustfulness symbolized in Lilith and her disciples, the young witch and the old witch, who pair off with Faust and Mephisto for the dance.

The scene is broken up by the escape of a red mouse from the mouth of the young witch, by the vision of Gretchen's *Idol*, and the sudden appearance of the rationalistic *Proktophantasmist*.

Thus Baumgart, whose exegesis is certainly attractive in its exclusion of the frivolous and meaningless in these scenes. If we accept it as correct, there is no place for Friedrich Schlegel in this portion of the *Walpurgisnacht*.

Witkowski and Valentin, though differing widely from Baumgart in other essential respects, both agree with him that contemporary satires are confined to the group of per-

sonages in the "little world." The only possible reference to Schlegel, then, is the implied recognition of youthful energy and progress. This is too general, and applies better to Weimar classicism than to the rising romanticism.

Minor disagrees with these three scholars and finds considerable contemporary satire in the *Walpurgisnacht* proper. The *Halbhexen* are symbolic of the half-natures, and half-talents, who seem to succeed by imitation, etc. If this is correct, then we are entitled to be more specific, for there is no better example of such half-talent in German literature in 1800 than the author of the *Lucinde*, with his jubilant confidence in his skill to produce elegiacs, iambics, trochaics, etc., on models of Goethe, August Wilhelm Schlegel, and the Spanish poets.

Whatever scholars assume as the aesthetic function of the *Traum*, whether it is the third part of a three-fold symbolic representation of evil in its entirety (Baumgart) or a *dilet-tanti* theater for the amusement of Faust and the extinction of impressions made by the *Idol* of Gretchen (Valentin), or an Intermezzo before the final ascent of the Brocken (Witkowski) or a part without organic connection introduced without sufficient aesthetic justification (Minor), all agree that we have here contemporary satire. Here we must seek for expressions in regard to the romanticists and their doctrinaire leader Friedrich Schlegel. But first let it be said that the *paralipomena* to this part, as well as to the whole scene, are so clearly not applicable to our problem that they need no consideration.

First of all, according to Baumgart, the stanza,—

"Fliegenschnauz und Mückennas
Mit ihren Anverwandten,
Frosch im Laub und Grill' im Gras,
Das sind die Musikanten."

is "eine wahrhaft köstliche Symbolik" for the whole assembly

on the German Parnassus, which Goethe and Schiller had called into being with their lyre. This must thus include the romanticists.¹

In the fivefold group which now passes by we have representatives of creation and criticism. Baumgart applies this group directly to the romanticists and refers particularly to unpleasant relations between Goethe and Tieck, which were due wholly to the Schlegels' efforts to elevate Tieck above Goethe. He refers to Schlegel's critical castigation of Goethe in the reviews of the *Horen* and *Musenalmanache*, and declares that the feelings so aroused determined Goethe to remember Friedrich upon the Blocksberg. This is readily conceivable in 1797, yet a more kindly feeling supervened before 1800. This was again followed by bitterness before 1802. The *Lucinde*, however, was perversity enough in itself to deserve a diabolic translation to the Brocken, even without the persistence of earlier vexations.

“Seht, da kommt der Dudelsack !
Es ist die Seifenblase.
Hört den Schneckeschnickeschnack
Durch seine stumpfe Nase.”

This represents the emptiness of romantic criticism with its vast pretensions. Romantic poetry, made in accordance with Schlegel's recipe, is described in the stanza,—

Geist der sich bildet.
Spinnenfuss und Krötenbauch
Und Flügelchen dem Wichtchen !
Zwar ein Tierchen giebt est nicht,
Doch giebt es ein Gedichtchen.

Baumgart's language, almost identical with that of Schiller's characterization of the *Lucinde* shows that he must have had Schlegel distinctly in mind, though he does not say so.²

¹ *BF.*, Bd. I, p. 372.

² *Ibid.*, p. 376. Cf. *GSR.*, July 19, 1799.

The stanza,—

Pärchen.

“Kleiner Schritt und hoher Sprung
Durch Honigthau und Düfte;
Zwar du trippelst mir genung
Doch geht's nicht in die Lüfte”

signifies “die in Süßigkeit schwelgende Inhaltslosigkeit, die schwungvoll sich gebärdende Unkraft der verschwommenen Lyrik” in the Schlegel-Tieck *Musenalmanach* of 1802. When we consider that the next following attacks are upon the older representatives of rationalism, the conclusions of Baumgart have much in their favor. We know that Goethe stood between the two extremes of romanticism and rationalism, and condemned both as æsthetically perverse.

Minor is very reserved. The *Dudelsack* represents the half-talents, the *Geist der sich bildet*, inorganic poems in general, the *Pärchen*, possibly the brothers Stolberg. But these guesses make Goethe's satires more pointless and less individual than is usual with the poet elsewhere in the *Intermezzo* and in the *Xenia*, to which these stanzas properly belong.

The next group for consideration is that of the *Nordischer Künstler*, who is preparing for the Italian journey. The *Purist* is a representative of that class who branded the classicism of Weimar as “lüderliche Lizenz,” who could not see “die edle Wahrheit keuscher Natur” in Goethe's *Roman Elegies*. The dressed and powdered matron and the stark-naked young witch are symbols of the two extremes, “anständig thuende Prüderie” and “freche Schamlosigkeit,” between which Goethe's poetry stands as a golden mean.¹

Minor agrees in general with Baumgart in respect to the meaning of the *Purist*, but sees reference to a definite literary

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 378 f.

phenomenon in the nude young witch. "Man kann bei ihr an die *Lucinde* von Friedrich Schlegel denken, wenn man einen spätern Zusatz annehmen will."¹

The whole orchestra is brought to confusion by the witch's appearance. Shall we see here the confusion brought into the whole romantic circle by the *Lucinde*, a fact in full accord with Minor's assumption, and at the same time confirmatory of Baumgart's identification of the choir with the romantic school? Or shall we see in it the general licentiousness of the romantic school, which left such blots on the *Lucinde* and the first version of Tieck's *Sternbald*, etc., a fact likewise confirmatory of Baumgart's view?

After the *Aufklärer* have received due attention, a new chorus enters:

"Da kommt ja wohl ein neues Chor,
Ich höre ferne Trommeln.
Nur ungestört! Es sind im Rohr
Die unisonen Dommeln."

It seems more in accord with Goethe's own views, and with the almost immediate appearance of a chorus of typical philosophers, to find here, with Minor, "das eintönige Schulgezänk der Philosophen" rather than droning "Frömmelei" in poetry. Goethe looked upon the disagreements within the single group of transcendental idealists at Jena as a lamentable defect. If Minor is right, then we must have here a reflection of the philosophic *colloquia* with Niethammer and Friedrich Schlegel.

When the philosophers do appear, we find among them the *Idealist*, who has to confess that, if the scenes on the Blocksberg are the product of his own ego, he surely must be insane. Fichte is the best representative of this type, but since these *are* types and not individuals, we may justly

¹ *MF.*, Bd. II, pp. 268 f.

make this stanza include Friedrich Schlegel, who, in spite of vague beginnings of realism, was in all essentials a Fichtean, especially at the time this scene was written.

On the whole, Friedrich seems to have been richly remembered on the Blocksberg, as richly as in the *Xenia*, though in less transparent guise, because of Goethe's more symbolic manner of writing.

D. INFLUENCES UPON GOETHE.

We have not interpreted our problem to include an examination of Goethe's writings from 1802 to his death, for the purpose of finding materials traceable to the teachings of Friedrich Schlegel anterior to his departure for Paris.

Goethe's later approaches to romanticism in the second part of *Faust* are already guaranteed in Schiller's *Näve und Sentimentalische Dichtung* and his private correspondence with Goethe upon *Faust*. Any further influence is due to the *creative* work of the school rather than the *critical*. Friedrich Schlegel's influence upon Goethe during his later life would doubtless be found to be a vanishing quantity.

But if we confine our inquiry to the period preceding 1802, any contribution of Schlegel to Goethe must be sought in one or more of three fields,—helpful knowledge, fruitful æsthetic theory, or models for imitation.

In the first field we know that Friedrich was of service. Goethe consulted him in regard to the name for *Paleophron und Neoterpe*, in regard to Greek trimeters and choric measures while working on the *Helena*, and in regard to *Margites*. Other instances are doubtless unrecorded. Schlegel's historic works, like the *Griechen und Römer*, were contributions to Goethe's knowledge of the subjects treated. More doubtful are his contributions to Goethe's understanding of idealistic

philosophy. But contributions of this sort have very little value, and may be passed by with mere mention.

When we consider Schlegel's career as a *theorist*, we may divide it into three periods;—a first *eclectic* period influenced by current æsthetic views of all schools, but growing more decisively dependent upon Schiller's teachings and coming more and more fully under the spell of Goethe's classic manner, its close being marked by independent study of the Greeks; a second period, the *earliest romantic* period, completely dominated by Goethe's poetry, especially *Wilhelm Meister* and by Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre*; a *third* period, when the romantic literatures of France, Italy, and Spain have begun to modify and complete his æsthetic doctrines.

Any real influence upon Goethe must of course come from the independent studies of the Greeks in the first period, or from his wider studies of the third. Otherwise we should have merely a reaction of Goethe upon Goethe.

Minor holds that Goethe obtained his doctrine of the epic from Friedrich Schlegel through August Wilhelm, but we have seen that Goethe never really accepted the Schlegel view. We have seen also that the Schlegels were led to formulate their doctrine of the epic more from an elaboration of Goethe's doctrine of the *Roman* found in *Wilhelm Meister* and his Schiller correspondence (which Körner undoubtedly brought to the eyes of Friedrich) than from independent studies of Homer. When Goethe says that he shall excuse the lack of unity in *Faust* upon the principle of the epic promulgated by the new school, it is so manifestly in jest, that it is incomprehensible that any scholar should consider it an earnest adoption of Schlegel's doctrine. Goethe sought to bring unity into his *Faust*, such unity as Homer's *Iliad* would have possessed, had its "gewaltige Tendenz zur Einheit" attained its goal. But the Gothic and the Greek elements refused to blend. Goethe, therefore, called the

whole a *monstrous birth*, and could scarcely bring himself to undertake a further development of it. Schiller's urgency and encouragement overcame this reluctance and Goethe proceeded. And then it was that Goethe jestingly remarked that he would have to avail himself of the new epic theory of the harmony of the parts and partial disharmony of the whole. But he never ceased trying to reduce the disjointedness.

Schlegel's doctrine of the *Roman* in the *Gesprach, Ath.*, III, seems to have had no influence upon Goethe's practice. Indeed, it could not. Nor had the *Ideen* any appreciable effect upon Goethe's moral and religious conceptions as they are laid before us by Harnack.¹

Goethe's use of trochaïcs in the *Walpurgisnacht* is referred in general to Friedrich Schlegel's experiments in that measure.² But there is a long road to traverse from a mere *post hoc* to a *propter hoc*. Goethe became interested in the Spanish literature through August Wilhelm Schlegel, and especially through Tieck. He read the Spanish poets at first hand. It seems almost incredible that the *Machwerke* of an unpoetic and purely formal imitator could have had any influence upon Goethe's metrical practice, not to mention a greater influence than the originals. August Wilhelm's practice had influence, for he had remarkable formal skill in the sonnet, in *terza rima*, *ottava rima*, and iambic pentameter, but Friedrich had no real skill as a versifier.

On the whole, almost any other member of the romantic circle could establish greater claims to influence upon Goethe than Friedrich Schlegel himself.

¹ *HG.*, Zweiter Abschnitt, pp. 17 ff.

² *MF.*, Bd. II, p. 239.

SUMMARY.

To sum up very briefly, Friedrich Schlegel was overwhelmingly dependent upon Goethe for the subject matter of literary work, materials for æsthetic and moral theory, and for models of imitation, while his own influence upon Goethe is exceedingly slight.

Schlegel passes through an æsthetic revolution comprising roughly the following stages: (1) Storm and Stress Germanism with Goethe as its idol; (2) theoretic Hellenism in support of Goethe's classicism; (3) romanticism based upon *Wilhelm Meister*, accompanied by a reduction of Greek models from their formerly accepted canonicity for German art; (4) romanticism based upon romance writers of early modern times, especially Cervantes.

All changes but the last were brought about by new insight into Goethe's art. Even the last may have been induced by a discovery of the essential sanity and unity of Goethe's works, and the latter's failure to respond to the dictatorial leadership of Friedrich.

Schlegel's personal relations with Goethe were never intimate. Goethe was patronizing and tolerant, and did not throw him over to please Schiller, but he never shared Goethe's personal or literary confidences. Goethe found it prudent to support the brothers against Nikolai, *et al.*, in journalism, and against Kotzebue and Co. in the theater, but he never approved their extreme romantic views and practices.

In conclusion, I wish to acknowledge that the foregoing essay owes its inception and much of what value it may possess to the suggestion and constant interest of Professor Max Winkler of the University of Michigan.

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following works have been carefully studied in the preparation of the above essay. The general histories whose chapters on the classic and romantic movements have been consulted are not here mentioned. The abbreviation used in referring to any work in the notes stands at the left of its title.

LITERARY WORKS.

- MS.* Friedrich Schlegel, 1794–1802, seine prosaischen Jugendschriften, hrsg. von Jakob Minor, Wien, 1882, 2 Bde.
Luc. Lucinde, Ein Roman von Friedrich Schlegel, ed. Reclam.
FSWke. Friedrich Schlegels Sämmtliche Werke, Zweite Original Ausgabe, Wien, 1846.
Ath. Athenäum, Eine Zeitschrift von August Wilhelm Schlegel und Friedrich Schlegel, Berlin, 1798–1800.
GWke. Goethes Werke, hrsg. im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie von Sachsen. Abt. I.
AWSWke. August Wilhelm von Schlegels Sämmtliche Werke, hrsg. von Edward Böcking, Leipzig, 1846, 12 Bde.
HWke. Wilhelm von Humboldt's Werke, Berlin, 1841, 7 Bde.

CORRESPONDENCE.

- WSBr.* Friedrich Schlegels Briefe an seinen Bruder August Wilhelm, hrsg. von Dr. Oskar F. Walzel, Berlin, 1890.
GSSBr. Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe, vierte Auflage, Cotta, Stuttgart, 1881, 2 Bde. Contents found also in *GWke.*, Abt. IV, and *JSBr.* under corresponding dates.
JSBr. Schillers Briefe, hrsg. und mit Anmerkungen versehen, von Fritz Jonas. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1892, 7 Bde.
 Goethes Briefe, Abt. IV, in *GWke.*
RDBr. Dorothea von Schlegel, geb. Mendelssohn, und deren Söhne Johannes und Philipp Veit, Briefwechsel im Auftrage der Familie Veit, hrsg. von Dr. J. M. Raich, Mainz, 1881, 2 Bde.
HTBr. Briefe an Ludwig Tieck, ausgewählt und hrsg. von Karl von Höltei, Breslau, 1864, 2 Bde.
RNBBr. Novalis' Briefwechsel mit Friedrich und August Wilhelm, Charlotte und Caroline Schlegel, hrsg. von Dr. J. M. Raich, Mainz, 1880.

- GZBr.* Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter in den Jahren 1796 bis 1832, hrsg. von Dr. Friedrich Wilhelm Riemer, Berlin, 1834.
- GuR.* Goethe und die Romantik. Briefe mit Erläuterungen, hrsg. von Carl Schüddekopf und Oskar Walzel, Weimar, Verlag der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 1898, 2 Bde.
- WCB.* Caroline, Briefe an ihre Geschwister, ihre Tochter Auguste, die Familie Gotter, F. S. W. Meyer, A. W. und Fr. Schlegel, J. Schelling, u. a. Hrsg. von G. Waitz, Leipzig, 1871, 2 Bde.
- GGE.* Goethes Gespräche mit Eckermann, contained also in *BGG.* under corresponding dates.
- BGG.* Goethes Gespräche. Herausgeber, Woldemar, Freiherr von Biedermann, Leipzig, 1889, 10 Bde.

TREATISES.

- HRS.* Die Romantische Schule, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Geistes von R. Haym, Berlin, 1870.
- HRomB.* Blütezeit der Romantik, von Ricarda Huch, Leipzig, 1901.
- HRomV.* Ausbreitung und Verfall der Romantik, von Ricarda Huch, Leipzig, 1902.
- Alt.* Schiller und die Brüder Schlegel, von Dr. Carl Alt, Weimar, 1904.
- PAesth.* Die Aesthetik August Wilhelm Schlegels in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung, von Nicklaus M. Pichtos, Berlin, 1894.
- Bern.* Schriften zur Kritik und Litteraturgeschichte von Michael Bernays, Stuttgart, 1895, 5 Bde.
- BXen.* Schiller und Goethe im Xenienkampf, von Edward Boas, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1851, 2 Bde.
- SSXen.* Xenien, 1796, Nach den Handschriften des Goethe und Schiller Archivs, hrsg. von Erich Schmidt und Bernard Suphan. Mit einem Facsimile. Weimar, Verlag der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 1893.
- MF.* Goethes Faust, Entstehungsgeschichte und Erklärung von Jakob Minor, Stuttgart, Erster Band, 1901, Zweiter Band, der erste Teil, 1901.
- WFW.* Die Walpurgisnacht im ersten Teile von Goethes Faust, von Georg Witkowski, Leipzig, 1894.
- VF.* Goethes Faustdichtung in ihrer künstlerischen Einheit, von Veit Valentin, Berlin, 1894.
- BF.* Goethes Faust als Einheitliche Dichtung, von Hermann Baumgart, Königsberg i. Pr., 1893, 2ter Band, 1902.
- HG.* Goethe in der Periode seiner Vollendung (1805-1832). Versuch einer Darstellung seiner Denkweise und Weltbetrachtung, von Dr. Otto Harnack, Leipzig, 1887.

- HGed.*^a Gedanken über Goethe, von Viktor Hehn, Berlin, 1887.
- SVBr.* Vertraute Briefe über die Lucinde, Schleiermachers Sämmtliche Werke, Abt. III, Bd. 1, pp. 421 f.
- DLS.* Aus dem Leben Schleiermachers, von Wilhelm Dilthey, Bd. 1, Berlin, 1870.
- HLH.* Herder, nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken dargestellt von R. Haym, Berlin, 1880.
- WGed.* Gedanken über die Nachahmung der Griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst, von J. J. Winckelmann, Deutsch. Litt. Denk. d. 18 u. 19 Jahr. in Neudrucken, hrsg. v. Bernard Seuffert, No. 20, Heilbronn, 1885.
- MNach.* Über die bildende Nachahmung des Schönen, von Karl Philipp Moritz, Neudrucke, No. 31, Heilbronn, 1888.
- DWM.* Der Einfluss Wilhelm Meisters auf den Roman der Romantiker, von J. Donner, Berlin, 1893.
- SLittgesch.* Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur seit Lessings Tod, von Julian Schmidt, Leipzig, 1858, 3 Bde.
- BLittgesch.* Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur, von Adolf Bartels, Leipzig, 1901-2.

ARTICLES.

- Biese.* Die Aesthetische Naturanschauung Goethes in ihren Vorbedingungen und in ihren Wandlungen. Dr. Alfred Biese. *Preuss. Jahrb.*, vol. 59, pp. 542 ff. and vol. 60, pp. 36 ff., 1887.
- CuR.* Classiker und Romantiker. Jakob Minor. *G. Jahrb.*, Bd. x, pp. 212 ff.
- Goethe und Kant. Karl Vorländer. *G. Jahrb.*, Bd. xix, pp. 180 ff.
- Ein deutsches Frauenleben aus der Zeit unsrer Litteraturblüte. R. Haym. *Preuss. Jahrb.*, Bd. 28, pp. 457 ff., November, 1871.
- Kleine Beiträge zur Charakteristik Goethes, von Friedrich Vischer. *G. Jahrb.*, Bd. iv, pp. 3-50.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

- a. *General.*
- b. *Relations as seen in later years.*

CAREER.

- A. PRIVATE. 1790 TO PUBLICATION OF *VON DEN SCHULEN* IN 1794.

1. *Göttingen.*
2. *Leipzig and Dresden.*
 - a.* Utterances about Goethe, etc.
 - β.* Intellectual occupations.
 - γ.* Personal factors.
 - a.* Father's death.
 - b.* Caroline Böhmer.
 - δ.* Traces of Goethe.

B. PUBLIC, 1794 TO 1802.

1. *Dresden, Publications.*
2. *Jena, first period.*
 - a.* Xenienkampf.
 - β.* Results, Continuation of Reviews, etc.
 - γ.* "Die Homerische Poesie."
 - δ.* "Das Studium der Griechischen Poesie."
 - ε.* "Lyceumsfragmente."
3. *Berlin.*
 - a.* Athenäum, vol. I.
 - a.* Fragmente.
 - b.* Wilhelm Meister.
 - I. Theories of Romantic Art, etc.
 - II. Irony.
 - c.* Goethe's reception of the Athenäum.
 - β.* Athenäum, vol. II.
 - a.* Religion and Morals, "Ideen."
 - γ.* Lucinde.
4. *Jena, Second Period.*
 - a.* Social Relations, etc.
 - β.* Athenäum, Vol. III.
 - a.* "Gespräch über die Poesie," etc.
 - γ.* Poetical activities in general.
 - a.* "Herkules Musagetes."
 - b.* "Alarkos" and its reception.

GENERAL MATTERS.

- C.* "WALPURGISNACHT" SATIRES.
- D.* INFLUENCES UPON GOETHE.

SUMMARY.

NOTES.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

